

A WEAK CONVERGENCE APPROACH TO INVENTORY CONTROL USING A LONG-TERM AVERAGE CRITERION

Kurt L. Helmes, Richard H. Stockbridge and Chao Zhu

Abstract. This paper continues the examination of inventory control in which the inventory is modelled by a diffusion process and a long-term average cost criterion is used to make decisions. The class of such models under consideration have general drift and diffusion coefficients and boundary points that are consistent with the notion that demand should tend to reduce the inventory level. The conditions on the cost functions are greatly relaxed from those in [Helmes et al. \(to appear\)](#). Characterization of the cost of a general (s, S) policy as a function of two variables naturally leads to a nonlinear optimization problem over the ordering levels s and S . Existence of an optimizing pair (s_*, S_*) is established for these models under very weak conditions; non-existence of an optimizing pair is also discussed. Using average expected occupation and ordering measures and weak convergence arguments, weak conditions are given for the optimality of the (s_*, S_*) ordering policy in the general class of admissible policies. The analysis involves an auxiliary function that is globally C^2 and which, together with the infimal cost, solve a particular system of linear equations and inequalities related to but different from the long-term average Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. This approach provides an analytical solution to the problem rather than a solution involving intricate analysis of the stochastic processes. The range of applicability of these results is illustrated on a drifted Brownian motion inventory model, both unconstrained and reflected, and on a geometric Brownian motion inventory model under three different cost structures.

MSC Classifications. 93E20, 90B05, 60H30

Key words. inventory, impulse control, long-term average cost, general diffusion models, (s, S) policies, weak convergence

1 Introduction

This paper further develops our examination of the long-term average cost criterion for inventory models of diffusion type in which the only control over the inventory levels is

through the action of ordering additional stock. It identifies *weak* sufficient conditions for optimality of an (s, S) ordering policy in the *general class* of admissible policies as well as providing some sufficient conditions for non-existence of an optimal (s, S) policy.

We model the inventory processes (in the absence of orders) as solutions to a stochastic differential equation

$$dX_0(t) = \mu(X_0(t)) dt + \sigma(X_0(t)) dW(t), \quad X_0(0) = x_0, \quad (1.1)$$

taking values in an interval $\mathcal{I} = (a, b)$; negative values of $X_0(t)$ represent back-ordered inventory.

An ordering policy (τ, Y) is a sequence of pairs $\{(\tau_k, Y_k) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in which τ_k denotes the (random) time at which the k^{th} order is placed and Y_k denotes its size. Since order $k+1$ cannot be placed before order k , $\{\tau_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an increasing sequence of times. The inventory level process X resulting from an ordering policy (τ, Y) therefore satisfies the equation

$$X(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t \mu(X(s)) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X(s)) dW(s) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t\}} Y_k. \quad (1.2)$$

Note the initial inventory level $X(0-) = x_0$ may be such that an order is placed at time 0 resulting in a new inventory level at time 0; this possibility occurs when $\tau_1 = 0$. Also observe that $X(\tau_k-)$ is the inventory level just prior to the k^{th} order being placed while $X(\tau_k)$ is the level with the new inventory. Thus, this model assumes that orders are filled instantaneously.

Let (τ, Y) be an ordering policy and X be the resulting inventory level process satisfying (1.2). Let c_0 and c_1 denote the holding/back-order cost rate and ordering cost functions, respectively. We assume there is some constant $k_1 > 0$ such that $c_1 \geq k_1$; this constant represents the fixed cost for placing each order. The long-term average expected holding/back-order plus ordering costs is

$$J_0(\tau, Y) := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t c_0(X(s)) ds + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t\}} c_1(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \right]. \quad (1.3)$$

The goal is to identify an admissible ordering policy so as to minimize the cost.

As mentioned earlier, we revisit the problem examined in [Helmes et al. \(to appear\)](#). We thus refer the reader to that paper for a discussion of the existing literature related to this problem; see also [Bensoussan \(2011\)](#). The current manuscript relaxes assumptions imposed on c_1 such as the concavity requirement in [Yao et al. \(2015\)](#). We focus the remainder of our comments on that which distinguishes this manuscript from our earlier publication.

The present paper differs from the published one in three significant respects: *solution approach*, *technical requirements* and *generality of results*. Here, we employ weak convergence of average expected occupation and ordering measures to analyze the long-term average costs whereas [Helmes et al. \(to appear\)](#) relies heavily on intricate pathwise analysis of the stochastic inventory processes. The benefit of the weak convergence approach lies in the ease of establishing the tightness of the expected occupation measures and hence their sequential compactness. This compactness ensures the existence of long-term average limiting measures that are key to the analysis of the costs. Quite surprisingly, tightness is not required of the

average expected ordering measures so there may not exist any limiting ordering measures. Nevertheless, a limiting argument establishes optimality in the general class of admissible policies of an (s_*, S_*) policy.

From a technical point of view, the weak convergence approach allows conditions on both cost functions c_0 and c_1 to be considerably relaxed by removing many structural requirements (compare Condition 2.3 below with Condition 2.3 of Helmes et al. (to appear)). For example, the requirement that c_0 approaches ∞ at each boundary and the rather restrictive modularity condition (2.6) of that paper on c_1 are unnecessary. In their places, we merely require that these functions be continuous, with c_0 continuous at the boundaries, an integrability condition on c_0 at the boundary b , differentiability of c_1 near the boundaries, as well as other boundedness relations contained in Conditions 4.6 and 5.8.

Most significantly, the two papers differ in how the auxiliary function is defined which, together with the infimal cost, form a solution of a particular system of linear equations and inequalities (see Proposition 5.1) related to but different from the long-term average Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. In the present manuscript, the auxiliary function G_0 is a C^2 function defined globally on $\mathcal{I}$, contrasting with the function G in the earlier one which C^1 -smoothly pastes two functions at a significant point in $\mathcal{I}$. Moreover, frequently in the literature, the long-term average auxiliary function is obtained from the value functions of discounted problems using the method of vanishing discount. The function G_0 in this paper is not obtained in this manner.

The functions G and G_0 in the two papers play a central role in establishing general optimality of an (s, S) ordering policy. This manuscript provides an analytic solution for the general model that applies to all policies in the admissible class $\mathcal{A}_0$ defined in (2.2) below. In contrast, the earlier publication only shows optimality in a smaller class of ordering policies for the general models under a more restrictive set of conditions. Optimality of (s, S) policies for the general class of admissible policies for two examples from He et al. (ArXiv 2016) and Helmes et al. (to appear) was established using ad hoc methods specifically tuned to the examples.

The next section gives the formulation of the inventory problem, defines two important functions and establishes some results pertaining to these functions. Section 3 introduces the average expected occupation and average expected ordering measures corresponding to an admissible ordering policy, gives a simple condition under which the expected occupation measures are tight and identifies a lower bound on the long-term average cost. (s, S) ordering policies are studied in Section 4 wherein a nonlinear function gives the corresponding long-term average costs and sufficient conditions are identified for both existence and non-existence of an optimal (s_*, S_*) ordering policy. The other main results of the paper are contained in Section 5 which defines the auxiliary function G_0 and uses carefully selected approximations G_n of G_0 to establish optimality of the (s_*, S_*) policy in the general class of admissible policies. Finally, Section 6 illustrates the ease of application of these results on examples involving a drifted Brownian motion, both unconstrained and with reflection at $\{0\}$, and a geometric Brownian motion having three different cost structures.

2 Formulation

Let $\mathcal{I} = (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. In the absence of ordering, the inventory process X_0 satisfies (1.1) and is assumed to be a regular diffusion. Throughout the paper we assume that the functions μ and σ are continuous on $\mathcal{I}$, and that (1.1) is nondegenerate. The initial position of X_0 is taken to be x_0 for some $x_0 \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ denote the filtration generated by X_0 , augmented so that it satisfies the usual conditions. We place the following restrictions on the underlying diffusion model.

Condition 2.1. (a) Both the speed measure M and the scale function S of the process X_0 are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure; that is, the scale function

$$S(x) := \int^x s(v) dv, \quad x \in \mathcal{I},$$

in which $s(x) = \exp(-\int^x [2\mu(v)/\sigma^2(v)] dv)$, and the speed measure

$$M[y, z] := \int_y^z m(v) dv, \quad [y, z] \subset \mathcal{I},$$

where $m(x) = 1/[\sigma^2(x)s(x)]$ is the speed density for $x \in \mathcal{I}$.

(b) The left boundary, a , of $\mathcal{I}$ is attracting ($S(a) < \infty$) and the right boundary b is non-attracting ($S(b) = \infty$). Moreover,

- (i)** when a is a reflecting boundary, $s(a)M[a, b] := \lim_{x \rightarrow a} s(x)M[x, b] < \infty$; and
- (ii)** when b is a natural boundary, $M[y, b] < \infty$ for each $y \in \mathcal{I}$.

The boundaries $a = -\infty$ and $b = \infty$ are required to be natural.

Since μ and σ are continuous and σ is non-degenerate in $\mathcal{I}$, $S(x) < \infty$ for $x \in \mathcal{I}$. Associated with the scale function S of Condition 2.1, one can define the scale measure on the Borel sets of $\mathcal{I}$ by $S[y, z] = S(z) - S(y)$ for $[y, z] \subset \mathcal{I}$.

From the modeling point of view, Condition 2.1(b) is reasonable since it essentially says that, in the absence of ordering, demand tends to reduce the size of the inventory. In addition, it imposes a reasonable restriction on “returns” since it implies that the inventory level will never reach level b in finite time (*a.s.*) solely by diffusion. According to Table 6.2 of Chapter 15 (p. 234) in Karlin and Taylor (1981), a may be a regular, exit or natural boundary point with a being attainable in the first two cases and unattainable in the third. In the case that a is a regular boundary, its boundary behavior must also be specified as being either reflective or sticky. When a is a reflecting boundary, Condition 2.1(b,i) imposes a restriction on the model while our analysis applies to a sticky boundary a without this additional condition. Again by Table 6.2 of Chapter 15 in Karlin and Taylor (1981), b is either a natural or an entrance boundary point and is unattainable from the interior in both cases. Condition 2.1(b,ii) imposes a restriction on the speed measure M when b is a

natural boundary. In order to unify our presentation for models having these various types of boundary points, we define the state space of possible inventory levels to be

$$\mathcal{E} = \begin{cases} (a, b), & \text{if } a \text{ and } b \text{ are natural boundaries,} \\ [a, b), & \text{if } a \text{ is attainable and } b \text{ is natural,} \\ (a, b], & \text{if } a \text{ is natural and } b \text{ is entrance,} \\ [a, b], & \text{if } a \text{ is attainable and } b \text{ is entrance.} \end{cases}$$

Define $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ to be the closure in $\mathbb{R}$ of $\mathcal{E}$; thus when a boundary is finite and natural, it is not an element of $\mathcal{E}$ but is in $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$. In particular, $\pm\infty \notin \overline{\mathcal{E}}$. Since orders increase the inventory level, define $\mathcal{R} = \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{E}^2 : y < z\}$ in which y denotes the pre-order and z the post-order inventory levels, respectively, and set $\overline{\mathcal{R}} = \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{E}^2 : y \leq z\}$; in contrast to $\mathcal{R}$, the set $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ includes orders of size 0. Notice the subtle distinction between $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ which includes boundaries that are finite and natural and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ which does not allow either coordinate to be such a point. The reason for this distinction lies in the fact that the expected ordering measures are not required to be tight.

Now specify the allowable types of orders and their costs as follows.

Definition 2.2. An ordering policy $(\tau, Y) := \{(\tau_k, Y_k) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is said to be *admissible* if X satisfies (1.2),

- (i) $\{\tau_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an increasing sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -stopping times,
- (ii) for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Y_k is nonnegative, $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_k}$ -measurable and satisfies $X(\tau_k) \in \mathcal{E}$, and
- (iii) if a is a reflecting boundary, $\mathbb{E}_{x_0}[L_a(t)]/t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, in which L_a denotes the local time of the inventory process X at a .

Note the last condition restricts the ordering policies under consideration so that, in the limit, no positive fraction of expected local time occurs at a reflecting left boundary. The class of admissible policies is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_0$.

Turning to the cost functions, we impose the following standing assumptions throughout the paper.

Condition 2.3. (a) The holding/back-order cost function $c_0 : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is continuous. When a and b are natural boundaries,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} c_0(x) =: c_0(a) \text{ exists in } \overline{\mathbb{R}^+} \text{ and } \lim_{x \rightarrow b} c_0(x) =: c_0(b) \text{ exists in } \overline{\mathbb{R}^+};$$

specifically when $a = -\infty$, then $c_0(-\infty) = \infty$, and $c_0(\infty) = \infty$ when $b = \infty$. Finally, for each $y \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\int_y^b c_0(v) dM(v) < \infty; \tag{2.1}$$

and when a is a reflecting boundary,

$$s(a) \int_a^b c_0(v) dM(v) := \lim_{x \rightarrow a} s(x) \int_x^b c_0(v) dM(v) < \infty. \tag{2.2}$$

- (b) The function $c_1 : \overline{\mathcal{R}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ is in $C(\overline{\mathcal{R}})$ with $c_1 \geq k_1 > 0$ for some constant k_1 . In addition, for each $z \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{a\}$, $c_1(\cdot, z)$ is continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of a . Similarly, for each $y \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{b\}$, $c_1(y, \cdot)$ is continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of b .

The model and cost assumptions place very mild conditions at the boundaries a and b . The integrability condition of c_0 with respect to M at b in (2.1) is imposed on the model since the decision maker does not have the option of reducing the inventory and therefore he or she cannot control how large the inventory level becomes. Should this condition fail, an infinite long-term average cost would accrue simply due to the process diffusing toward the boundary b . The technical condition (2.2) is used in Lemma 5.9 to analyze the approximating functions G_n of Section 5.

We now identify important operators related to any solution X of (1.2) under a policy $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$. The generator of the process X between jumps (corresponding to the diffusion X_0) is

$$Af = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} f'' + \mu f' \quad (2.3)$$

which is defined for all $f \in C^2(\mathcal{I})$. Observe that A has the representation $A = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dM} \left(\frac{df}{dS} \right)$. To capture the effect ordering has on the inventory process, define the jump operator $B : C(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow C(\overline{\mathcal{R}})$ by

$$Bf(y, z) = f(z) - f(y) \quad \text{for } (y, z) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}.$$

Two functions play a central role in our search for an optimal ordering policy both in the class of (s, S) policies and, in the more general class $\mathcal{A}_0$.

2.1 Key functions

Using the initial position $x_0 \in \mathcal{I}$, define the functions g_0 and ζ on $\mathcal{I}$ by

$$g_0(x) := \int_{x_0}^x \int_u^b 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\zeta(x) := \int_{x_0}^x 2M[u, b] dS(u) \quad (2.5)$$

and extend these functions to $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ by continuity. Observe that g_0 may take values $\pm\infty$ at the boundaries. Note the requirement of Condition 2.1(b,ii) that $M[y, b] < \infty$ for all $y \in \mathcal{I}$ when b is a natural boundary is necessary to ensure that ζ is finite on $\mathcal{I}$. Similarly (2.1) of Condition 2.3(a) is required for g_0 to be finite. It immediately follows that g_0 and ζ , respectively, are particular solutions on $\mathcal{I}$ of

$$\begin{cases} Af = -c_0, \\ f(x_0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} Af = -1, \\ f(x_0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Other solutions to these differential equations with constraint at x_0 include summands of the form $K(S(x) - S(x_0))$ since the constant function and the scale function S are linearly independent solutions of the homogeneous equation $Af = 0$. However, such additional terms grow too quickly near the boundary b so that a transversality condition in Proposition 5.2

fails (see Remark 5.3) and therefore the definitions of g_0 and ζ in (2.4) and (2.5), respectively, exclude these terms.

Observe that both g_0 and ζ are negative on (a, x_0) and positive on (x_0, b) . The following monotonicity results for g_0 and ζ are established by Proposition 2.6 of Helmes et al. (to appear).

Proposition 2.4. *Assume Conditions 2.1 and 2.3 hold. Let g_0 and ζ be defined by (2.4) and (2.5), respectively. Let $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$ and let X_0 satisfy (1.1) with $X_0(0) = z$. Define $\tau_y = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_0(t) = y\}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_z \left[\int_0^{\tau_y} c_0(X_0(s)) ds \right] = g_0(z) - g_0(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_z[\tau_y] = \zeta(z) - \zeta(y).$$

We now establish the asymptotic behaviour of ζ at the left boundary and the asymptotic relation between g_0 and ζ at the boundaries when they are natural.

Lemma 2.5. *Assume Condition 2.1 holds and let ζ be defined by (2.5). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{y \rightarrow a} \zeta(y) &> -\infty, & \text{if } a \text{ is attainable (regular or exit),} \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow a} \zeta(y) &= -\infty, & \text{if } a \text{ is unattainable (natural).} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Fix $z \in \mathcal{E}$ with $z > a$. For each $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$, by the definition of ζ in (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} B\zeta(y, z) &= \int_y^z M[u, b] dS(u) = \int_y^z M[u, z] dS(u) + M[z, b] S[y, z] \\ &\xrightarrow{y \downarrow a} \int_a^z M[u, z] dS(u) + M[z, b] S(a, z] \\ &=: \Sigma(a) + M[z, b] S(a, z]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover by Table 6.2 on page 234 of Karlin and Taylor (1981), the point a is attainable or unattainable according to whether $\Sigma(a) < \infty$ or $\Sigma(a) = \infty$, respectively. By Condition 2.1(b), $M[z, b] < \infty$ and $S(a, z] < \infty$. Thus it follows from (2.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{y \rightarrow a} B\zeta(y, z) &< \infty, & \text{when } a \text{ is attainable, and} \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow a} B\zeta(y, z) &= \infty, & \text{when } a \text{ is unattainable,} \end{aligned}$$

which establishes the result. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose a and b are natural boundaries and let $c_0(a)$ and $c_0(b)$ be as in Condition 2.3(a). Then the following asymptotic behaviours hold:*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = c_0(a), \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{I}; \quad \lim_{z \rightarrow b} \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = c_0(b), \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{I}; \tag{2.7}$$

$$\lim_{(y, z) \rightarrow (a, a)} \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = c_0(a); \quad \lim_{(y, z) \rightarrow (b, b)} \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = c_0(b); \tag{2.8}$$

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(y)}{\zeta(y)} = c_0(a); \quad \lim_{z \rightarrow b} \frac{g_0(z)}{\zeta(z)} = c_0(b), \tag{2.9}$$

implying $\lim_{y \rightarrow a} g_0(y) = -\infty$ when $c_0(a) > 0$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow b} g_0(z) = \infty$ when $c_0(b) > 0$.

Proof. The arguments related to the right boundary b are very similar to and a bit more straightforward than those related to the left boundary a . We therefore leave the verification of the limits at b to the reader.

Similarly, the argument when $c_0(a) = \infty$ is essentially the same (using the definition of a limit being ∞) as when $c_0(a) < \infty$ so we give the details in the latter instance. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily and let $y_\epsilon \in \mathcal{I}$ be such that for all $a < x < y_\epsilon$, $|c_0(x) - c_0(a)| < \epsilon$. For $a < y < y_\epsilon$, define τ_y to be the first hitting time of $\{y\}$ by the process X_0 of (1.1) when $X_0(0) = y_\epsilon$. Since a is a natural boundary, Proposition 2.4 yields

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow a} (\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)) = \lim_{y \rightarrow a} \mathbb{E}_{y_\epsilon}[\tau_y] = \infty.$$

Using the definition of ζ in (2.5), observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y) &= \int_y^{y_\epsilon} \int_u^b 2 dM(v) dS(u) \\ &= \int_y^{y_\epsilon} \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2 dM(v) dS(u) + 2M[y_\epsilon, b]S[y, y_\epsilon]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

By Condition 2.1(b), $M[y_\epsilon, b] < \infty$ and since a is attracting, $\lim_{y \rightarrow a} S[y, y_\epsilon] = S(a, y_\epsilon) < \infty$. Thus the limit of the double integral as $y \rightarrow a$ is infinite.

Similarly to (2.10) using the definition of g_0 in (2.4), we have

$$g_0(y_\epsilon) - g_0(y) = \int_y^{y_\epsilon} \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u) + 2 \left(\int_{y_\epsilon}^b c_0(v) dM(v) \right) S[y, y_\epsilon].$$

Due to the integrability condition (2.1) on c_0 relative to the speed measure M , the second term on the right-hand side remains bounded as $y \rightarrow a$. Therefore writing

$$\frac{g_0(y_\epsilon) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)} = \frac{\int_y^{y_\epsilon} \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u)}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)} + \frac{2 \left(\int_{y_\epsilon}^b c_0(v) dM(v) \right) S[y, y_\epsilon]}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)},$$

the second summand converges to 0 as $y \rightarrow a$ so the asymptotics is determined by the first summand. Using (2.10), observe that

$$\frac{\int_y^{y_\epsilon} \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u)}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)} = \frac{\int_y^{y_\epsilon} \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u)}{\int_y^{y_\epsilon} \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2 dM(v) dS(u)} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2M[y_\epsilon, b]S[y, y_\epsilon]}{\int_y^{y_\epsilon} \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2 dM(v) dS(u)}}.$$

The second factor converges to 1 as $y \rightarrow a$ so by the choice of y_ϵ , we have

$$c_0(a) - \epsilon \leq \liminf_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(y_\epsilon) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)} \leq \limsup_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(y_\epsilon) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)} \leq c_0(a) + \epsilon. \quad (2.11)$$

Recall, $\zeta(y) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $y \rightarrow a$. In the case $g_0(y)$ remains bounded as $y \rightarrow a$, then $\lim_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(y)}{\zeta(y)} = 0$. Moreover, the limit exists in (2.11) and equals 0 so

$$c_0(a) - \epsilon \leq \lim_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(y_\epsilon) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)} = 0 \leq c_0(a) + \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, it follows that $c_0(a) = 0$ and hence (2.9) holds.

When $g_0(y) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $y \rightarrow a$, we have

$$c_0(a) - \epsilon \leq \liminf_{y \rightarrow a} \left(\frac{g_0(y)}{\zeta(y)} \cdot \frac{\frac{g_0(y_\epsilon)}{g_0(y)} - 1}{\frac{\zeta(y_\epsilon)}{\zeta(y)} - 1} \right) = \liminf_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(y)}{\zeta(y)}$$

and similarly

$$\limsup_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(y)}{\zeta(y)} \leq c_0(a) + \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, it again follows that $\lim_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{g_0(y)}{\zeta(y)} = c_0(a)$, establishing (2.9). Picking $z \in \mathcal{E}$ arbitrarily, the identity (2.7) now follows.

A similar argument addresses (2.8). Again using the definitions of g_0 and ζ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} &= \frac{\int_y^z \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u) + \left(\int_{y_\epsilon}^b 2c_0(v) dM(v) \right) S[y, z]}{\int_y^z 2M[u, y_\epsilon] dS(u) + 2M[y_\epsilon, b] S[y, z]} \\ &= \frac{\frac{\int_y^z \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u)}{\int_y^z \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2 dM(v) dS(u)} + \frac{\left(\int_{y_\epsilon}^b 2c_0(v) dM(v) \right) S[y, z]}{\int_y^z 2M[u, y_\epsilon] dS(u)}}{1 + \frac{2M[y_\epsilon, b] S[y, z]}{\int_y^z 2M[u, y_\epsilon] dS(u)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since a is attracting, $S(a) < \infty$ and since it is a natural boundary, $\zeta(a) = -\infty$. Together, these imply that $\lim_{y \rightarrow a} M[y, z] = \infty$; this holds, in particular, when $z = y_\epsilon$. Examining the second summands in both the numerator and denominator above, set K below to be $K = M[y_\epsilon, b]$ for the denominator term and $K = \int_{y_\epsilon}^b c_0(v) dM(v)$ for the numerator summand. Then

$$\frac{2KS[y, z]}{\int_y^z 2M[u, y_\epsilon] dS(u)} \leq \frac{2KS[y, z]}{2M[z, y_\epsilon] S[y, z]}$$

and the right-hand side converges to 0 as $z \rightarrow a$. Thus for all $y < z \leq y_\epsilon$,

$$c_0(a) - \epsilon \leq \liminf_{(y, z) \rightarrow (a, a)} \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = \limsup_{(y, z) \rightarrow (a, a)} \frac{\int_y^z \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u)}{\int_y^z \int_u^{y_\epsilon} 2 dM(v) dS(u)} \leq c_0(a) + \epsilon$$

and the result follows since ϵ is arbitrary. $\square$

3 Expected Occupation Measures

For $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$, let X denote the resulting inventory level process satisfying (1.2). For each $t > 0$, define the average expected occupation measure $\mu_{0,t}$ on $\mathcal{E}$ and the average expected ordering measure $\mu_{1,t}$ on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{0,t}(\Gamma_0) &= \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t I_{\Gamma_0}(X(s)) ds \right], & \Gamma_0 &\in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}), \\ \mu_{1,t}(\Gamma_1) &= \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t\}} I_{\Gamma_1}(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \right], & \Gamma_1 &\in \mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{R}}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

If a is a reflecting boundary, define the average expected local time measure $\mu_{2,t}$ for each $t > 0$ to place a point mass on $\{a\}$ given by

$$\mu_{2,t}(\{a\}) = \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[L_a(t)] \quad (3.2)$$

in which L_a denotes the local time of X at a .

Remark 3.1. For each $t > 0$, the average expected occupation measure $\mu_{0,t}$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{I}$. In addition, for each $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ with $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$, $\mu_{1,t}$ has finite mass for each t and $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{1,t}(\overline{\mathcal{R}}) \leq J_0(\tau, Y)/k_1$. By definition of $\mathcal{A}_0$, the mass of $\mu_{2,t}$ converges to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Finally observe that when a is a sticky boundary, $\mu_{0,t}$ places a point mass at a for those policies (τ, Y) that allow the process X to stick at a with positive probability.

We are interested in the relative compactness of the collection of $\mu_{0,t}$ measures. The first result shows that for any sequence $\{t_i\}$ going to ∞ , the collection $\{\mu_{0,t_i}\}$ is well-behaved for policies (τ, Y) that are of interest.

Proposition 3.2. *For $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$, let X denote the resulting inventory process satisfying (1.2). Let $\{t_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} t_i = \infty$ and for each i , define μ_{0,t_i} by (3.1). If $\{\mu_{0,t_i} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is not tight, then $J_0(\tau, Y) = \infty$.*

Proof. If a, b are both finite, then each $\mu_{0,t}$ has its support in $\overline{\mathcal{E}} = [a, b]$ regardless of the types of boundary points. The collection $\{\mu_{0,t} : t \geq 1\}$ is therefore tight. Thus for this collection not to be tight, either $a = -\infty$ or $b = \infty$.

Suppose $\{\mu_{0,t_i}\}$ is not tight. By Condition 2.3(a), $c_0(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow a$ or as $x \rightarrow b$. The lack of tightness of $\{\mu_{0,t_i}\}$ means that there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all compact sets K and $T > 0$, there exists $t_i \geq T$ for which $\mu_{0,t_i}(K^c) \geq \epsilon$. Arbitrarily select $M < \infty$ and set $K = \{x \in \overline{\mathcal{E}} : c_0(x) \leq M/\epsilon\}$, noting that K is compact. Then there exists a subsequence $\{t_{i_j} : i_j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for which $\mu_{0,t_{i_j}}(K^c) \geq \epsilon$. Therefore for each i_j ,

$$\begin{aligned} t_{i_j}^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t_{i_j}} c_0(X(s)) ds \right] &= \int_{\mathcal{I}} c_0(x) \mu_{0,t_{i_j}}(dx) \\ &\geq \int_{K^c} c_0(x) \mu_{0,t_{i_j}}(dx) \\ &\geq \frac{M}{\epsilon} \mu_{0,t_{i_j}}(K^c) \geq M. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t c_0(X(s)) ds \right] \geq M$. It therefore follows that $J_0(\tau, Y) = \infty$ since M is arbitrary. $\square$

As a consequence of Proposition 3.2, when either $a = -\infty$ or $b = \infty$ we only need to consider those ordering policies (τ, Y) for which the collection $\{\mu_{0,t} : t \geq 0\}$ is tight. We denote a generic weak limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ by μ_0 . Observe that the support of μ_0 might be $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$. The continuity assumptions on c_0 at the boundaries in Condition 2.3 are required due to the limiting measures possibly placing mass there.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume Conditions 2.1 and 2.3 hold. Let $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ with $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$, X satisfy (1.2), and define $\mu_{0,t}$ by (3.1) for each $t > 0$. Then for each μ_0 attained as a weak limit of some sequence $\{\mu_{0,t_j}\}$ as $t_j \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\int c_0(x) \mu_0(dx) \leq J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty.$$

Proof. Let μ_0 and $\{t_j\}$ and $\{\mu_{0,t_j}\}$ be as in the statement of the proposition. Since $\{\mu_{0,t_j}\}, \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\bar{\mathcal{E}})$, the Skorohod representation theorem implies there exist random variables $\{\Xi_j\}$ and Ξ , defined on a common probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{P})$, such that Ξ has distribution μ_0 , Ξ_j has distribution μ_{0,t_j} for each j , and $\Xi_j \rightarrow \Xi$ almost surely as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Since c_0 is bounded below, we may apply Fatou's lemma to obtain

$$\int c_0(x) \mu_0(dx) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[c_0(\Xi)] \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[c_0(\Xi_j)] = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int c_0(x) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx).$$

As a result,

$$\int c_0(x) \mu_0(dx) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int c_0(x) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx) \leq J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

□

We note that c_0 being infinite at a boundary implies that μ_0 cannot assign any positive mass at this point. In particular, for models in which a is a sticky boundary and $c_0(a) = \infty$, any policy which allows X to stick at a on a set of positive probability incurs an infinite average expected cost for each t and thus has $J_0(\tau, Y) = \infty$. The condition $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$ therefore eliminates such (τ, Y) from consideration.

Remark 3.4. The inf-compactness of c_0 is central to $J_0(\tau, Y)$ implying that $\{\mu_{0,t}\}$ is tight as $t \rightarrow \infty$. A similar result follows in the case that c_1 is inf-compact as well. However, inf-compactness fails for many natural ordering cost functions; in particular, the most commonly studied function $c_1(y, z) = k_1 + k_2(z - y)$, $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$, comprising fixed plus proportional costs is not inf-compact on an unbounded region of $\mathbb{R}^2$. The accompanying paper [Helves et al. \(preprint\)](#) contains an example which shows that even the requirement of a finite long-term average cost is insufficient to guarantee tightness of $\{\mu_{1,t}\}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Fortunately, our method of solution does not rely on tightness of the average expected ordering measures.

4 Analysis of (s, S) Ordering Policies

The road to the solution of the long-term average inventory problem benefits by examining the behaviour of X under (y, z) ordering policies defined in (4.1) below, for $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$. Under the weak conditions on c_0 and c_1 in Condition 2.3, a careful analysis of the representation of the costs for such policies leads to Theorem 4.8 which establishes existence of an optimal (s_*, S_*) policy in the class of all such policies.

Proposition 4.1 (Proposition 3.1 of [Helmes et al. \(to appear\)](#)). Assume Conditions 2.1 and 2.3. Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{I}$ and $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$. Set $\tau_0 = 0$ and define the ordering policy (τ, Y) by

$$\begin{cases} \tau_k = \inf\{t > \tau_{k-1} : X(t-) \leq y\}, \\ Y_k = z - X(\tau_k-), \end{cases} \quad k \geq 1, \quad (4.1)$$

in which X is the inventory level process satisfying (1.2) with this ordering policy. Then X has a stationary distribution with density π on $\mathcal{E}$ given by

$$\pi(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & a < x \leq y, \\ 2\kappa m(x) S[y, x], & y \leq x \leq z, \\ 2\kappa m(x) S[y, z], & z \leq x < b, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

in which

$$\kappa = \left(\int_y^z 2S[y, x] dM(x) + 2S[y, z] M[z, b] \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{B\zeta(y, z)}. \quad (4.3)$$

is the normalizing constant. Moreover, the constant κ gives the expected frequency of orders.

Remark 4.2. In the case that a is an attainable boundary and $y = a$ in Proposition 4.1, the interval $(a, y) = \emptyset$ and the first expression for π is omitted. Similarly, the last expression for π is omitted when b is an entrance boundary and $z = b$ since the interval $(z, b) = \emptyset$.

A renewal argument characterizes the long-term average cost $J_0(\tau, Y)$ for the (y, z) ordering policy in (4.1).

Proposition 4.3. Assume Conditions 2.1 and 2.3 hold. Fix $x_0 \in \mathcal{I}$, let $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$. Define the (τ, Y) policy by (4.1) and let X satisfy (1.2). When a is either an exit or regular boundary, assume $g_0(a) > -\infty$ and, similarly, assume $g_0(b) < \infty$ when b is an entrance boundary. Then we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t c_0(X(s)) ds = \frac{Bg_0(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)} \quad (a.s.) \quad (4.4)$$

and, more importantly,

$$J_0(\tau, Y) = \frac{c_1(y, z) + Bg_0(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)}. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. Proposition 3.4 of [Helmes et al. \(to appear\)](#) establishes the result for models in which c_0 is asymptotically infinite at both boundaries, a condition in the current paper required only when $a = -\infty$ and $b = \infty$, and (y, z) is in the interior of $\mathcal{R}$. The proof, however, remains valid whenever $a > -\infty$ is attainable or $b < \infty$ is an entrance point (in which cases $a, b \in \mathcal{E}$) as long as g_0 is finite. $\square$

Remark 4.4. Observe that (4.3) and (4.5) imply that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t c_0(X(s)) ds \right] = \frac{Bg_0(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)}.$$

Moreover, a simple derivation in the proof of Proposition 3.4 of [Helmes et al. \(to appear\)](#) shows that

$$\int c_0(x)\pi(x) dx = \frac{Bg_0(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)}$$

in which π is given by (4.2). Thus letting μ_0 be the probability measure on $\mathcal{E}$ having density π and $\mu_{0,t}$ be as in (3.1), it follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int c_0(x) \mu_{0,t}(dx) = \int c_0(x) \mu_0(dx). \quad (4.6)$$

Motivated by Proposition 4.3, define the function F_0 on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ by

$$F_0(y, z) := \begin{cases} \frac{c_1(y, z) + Bg_0(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)}, & (y, z) \in \mathcal{R}, \\ \infty, & (y, y) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}. \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

Observe that F_0 is well-defined and continuous on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$.

The initial step in solving the inventory control problem is to establish the existence of a minimal value of F_0 and a minimizing pair (y_0^*, z_0^*) . First, notice that since $c_1 > 0$, $F_0(y, z) > 0$ for every $(y, z) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ and thus $\inf_{(y, z) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}} F_0(y, z) =: F_0^* \geq 0$. For those models in which $F_0^* = 0$, however, it immediately follows that there is no minimizing pair (y_0^*, z_0^*) of F_0 . The next proposition gives some sufficient conditions in which this case holds.

Proposition 4.5. *Assume Conditions 2.1 and 2.3 hold. Also assume any of the following conditions:*

(a) *The point $a > -\infty$ is a natural boundary and for some $z \in \mathcal{E}$,*

$$\liminf_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{c_1(y, z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y)} = 0.$$

(b) *The point $b < \infty$ is a natural boundary and for some $y \in \mathcal{E}$,*

$$\liminf_{z \rightarrow b} \frac{c_1(y, z) + g_0(z)}{\zeta(z)} = 0.$$

(c) *The point $a > -\infty$ is a natural boundary for which $c_0(a) = 0$ and*

$$\liminf_{(y, z) \rightarrow (a, a)} \frac{c_1(y, z)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

(d) *The point $b < \infty$ is a natural boundary for which $c_0(b) = 0$ and*

$$\liminf_{(y, z) \rightarrow (b, b)} \frac{c_1(y, z)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = 0. \quad (4.9)$$

Then $F_0^* = 0$ and there does not exist any pair $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$ which minimizes F_0 .

Proof. The arguments in cases (a) and (b) are essentially the same so we establish the result when (a) holds. Since a is a natural boundary, Lemma 2.5 implies $\zeta(y) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $y \rightarrow a$. Thus under the hypothesis in (a), for some $z \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$0 = \lim_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{c_1(y, z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y)} = \lim_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{c_1(y, z) + g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = \lim_{y \rightarrow a} F_0(y, z).$$

Since $F_0(y, z) > 0$ for all $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$, the result follows.

Now suppose (c) or (d) holds. Then combining (4.8) or (4.9) with (2.8) of Lemma 2.6 establishes that $F_0^* = 0$ and, again, the result holds. $\square$

We now identify a set of conditions under which F_0 achieves its minimal value at some point $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$.

Condition 4.6. The following conditions hold:

(a) The boundary a is regular; or exit; or a is a natural boundary for which either (i) or (ii) hold:

(i) $c_0(a) = \infty$;

(ii) $c_0(a) < \infty$ and for each $z \in \mathcal{E}$, there exists some $y_z > a$ such that for $a < y < y_z$,

$$\frac{-\frac{\partial c_1}{\partial y}(y, z) + g'_0(y)}{\zeta'(y)} > F_0(y, z), \quad (4.10)$$

and there exists some $(\hat{y}, \hat{z}) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$F_0(\hat{y}, \hat{z}) < c_0(a). \quad (4.11)$$

(b) The boundary b is entrance; or b is natural for which either (i) or (ii) hold:

(i) $c_0(b) = \infty$;

(ii) $c_0(b) < \infty$ and for each $y \in \mathcal{E}$, there exists some $z_y < b$ such that for $z_y < z < b$,

$$\frac{\frac{\partial c_1}{\partial z}(y, z) + g'_0(z)}{\zeta'(z)} > F_0(y, z), \quad (4.12)$$

and there exists some $(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$F_0(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) < c_0(b). \quad (4.13)$$

Observe that the conditions $F_0(\hat{y}, \hat{z}) < c_0(a)$ and $F_0(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) < c_0(b)$ imply that $c_0(a) > F_0^*$ and similarly, $c_0(b) > F_0^*$.

Remark 4.7. The inequalities (4.10) and (4.12) have an economic interpretation. For simplicity, assume $(a, b) \subseteq (0, \infty)$. By Propositions 2.4 and 4.3, the function F_0 represents the long-term average cost for each (y, z) ordering policy as the ratio of the expected cost

$c_1(y, z) + g_0(z) - g_0(y)$ over a cycle to the expected cycle length $\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)$ for the (y, z) ordering policy.

We begin by examining the inequality (4.12) near the boundary b . First observe that ζ is an increasing function so $\zeta' > 0$. Using the definition of F_0 in (4.7), the inequality (4.12) can equivalently be written as

$$\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial z}[c_1(y, z) + g_0(z) - g_0(y)]}{c_1(y, z) + g_0(z) - g_0(y)} > \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial z}[\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)]}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} \quad (4.14)$$

and multiplying by z on both sides preserves the inequality. Thus Condition 4.6(b) requires that for each $y \in \mathcal{E}$, there exists some (y -dependent) neighbourhood of b on which the expected cost per cycle *is more elastic* than the expected cycle length (with respect to variations of z).

A similar rearrangement of (4.10) yields

$$\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial y}[c_1(y, z) + g_0(z) - g_0(y)]}{c_1(y, z) + g_0(z) - g_0(y)} < \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial y}[\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)]}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)}.$$

Again, for each $z \in \mathcal{E}$, there is some (z -dependent) neighbourhood of a on which the expected cost per cycle is less elastic than the expected cycle length with respect to variations of y .

We now demonstrate the existence of a minimizing pair $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$ of F_0 .

Theorem 4.8. *Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3 and 4.6 hold. Then there exists a pair $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that*

$$F_0(y_0^*, z_0^*) = F_0^* = \inf\{F_0(y, z) : (y, z) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}\}. \quad (4.15)$$

Proof. We examine the behaviour of F_0 at each boundary.

Case i: the diagonal $z = y$, excluding natural boundaries. For each $y \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{b\}$, $F_0(y, y) = \lim_{z \searrow y} F_0(y, z) = \infty$ since $c_1 \geq k_1 > 0$. Note in particular, this argument applies to a when it is either a regular or exit boundary. When b is an entrance boundary, $\zeta(b) < \infty$ and again $F_0(b, b) = \lim_{y \nearrow b} F_0(y, b) = \infty$. So the minimum of F_0 is not achieved on the diagonal $y = z$.

Case ii: the boundary $z = b$, excluding (a, b) when a is natural. Again, suppose b is an entrance boundary so $\zeta(b) < \infty$. It follows that for each $y \in \mathcal{E}$ with $y < b$, $F_0(y, b) = \lim_{z \rightarrow b} F_0(y, z)$ exists in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$. The optimization of F_0 therefore includes the possibility $z = b$.

Next assume b is a natural boundary for which $c_0(b) = \infty$. Since b is natural, $\lim_{x \rightarrow b} \zeta(x) = \infty$ and therefore $c_0(b) = \infty$ implies $\lim_{x \rightarrow b} g_0(x) = \infty$. Let $y \in \mathcal{E}$ be fixed. Then using the definitions of g_0 and ζ in (2.4) and (2.5), respectively, and applying L'Hôpital's rule, we have

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow b} F_0(y, z) \geq \lim_{z \rightarrow b} \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = \lim_{z \rightarrow b} \frac{\int_z^b c_0(v) dM(v)}{\int_z^b 1 dM(v)}. \quad (4.16)$$

Pick $K > 0$ arbitrarily. Since $c_0(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow b$, there is some z_K such that $c_0(x) \geq K$ for all $x \geq z_K$. Thus the right-hand side of (4.16) is bounded below by K implying $\lim_{z \rightarrow b} F_0(y, z) = \infty$.

Now assume that $b < \infty$ is a natural boundary with $c_0(b) < \infty$ for which Condition 4.6(b,ii) holds. Then for each $y \in \mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial z}(y, z) &= \frac{\frac{\partial c_1}{\partial z}(y, z) + g'_0(z)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} - \frac{[c_1(y, z) + g_0(z) - g_0(y)]\zeta'(z)}{[\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)]^2} \\ &= \left[\frac{\frac{\partial c_1}{\partial z}(y, z) + g'_0(z)}{\zeta'(z)} - F_0(y, z) \right] \cdot \frac{\zeta'(z)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for each $y \in \mathcal{E}$, Condition 4.6(b,ii) implies that $F_0(y, \cdot)$ is increasing for $z > z_y$ and thus the infimal value of F_0 is not obtained in the limit as $z \rightarrow b$.

Case iii: the boundary $y = a$, excluding (a, b) when b is natural. Now consider the case in which a is a regular or an exit boundary. This means a is attainable so by Lemma 2.5, $\zeta(a) > -\infty$. Then $F_0(a, z)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}^+$ with $\lim_{y \rightarrow a} F_0(y, z) = F_0(a, z)$, for each $z \in \mathcal{E}$ with $z > a$. The optimization of F_0 includes values with $y = a$.

Next let a be a natural boundary for which $c_0(a) = \infty$. By Lemma 2.5, $\lim_{y \rightarrow a} \zeta(y) = -\infty$ and Lemma 2.6 shows that $\lim_{y \rightarrow a} g_0(y) = -\infty$. For fixed $z \in \mathcal{E}$, a similar analysis as in (4.16) yields

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow a} F_0(y, z) \geq \lim_{y \rightarrow a} \frac{\int_y^b c_0(v) dM(v)}{\int_y^b 1 dM(v)}. \quad (4.17)$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 6.3(v) on p. 231 of Karlin and Taylor (1981), since $S(a, x] < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\Sigma(a) = \infty$, we must have $M(a, x] = \infty$ for any $x \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus we have $\lim_{y \downarrow a} M[y, b) = \infty$. It therefore follows that $\lim_{y \downarrow a} \int_y^b c_0(v) dM(v) = \infty$. We can again apply L'Hôpital's rule to the right-hand side of (4.17) to obtain

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow a} F_0(y, z) \geq \lim_{y \rightarrow a} c_0(y) = \infty. \quad (4.18)$$

Finally, consider $a > -\infty$ being a natural boundary with $c_0(a) < \infty$ for which Condition 4.6(a,ii) holds. Similar to the analysis pertaining to b when Condition 4.6(b,ii) holds, taking the partial derivative of F_0 with respect to y shows that $F_0(\cdot, z)$ is strictly decreasing for each $z \in \mathcal{E}$ and hence the infimal value of F_0 does not occur in the limit as $y \rightarrow a$.

It remains to examine the asymptotics of $F_0(y, z)$ as (y, z) converges to the vertices (a, a) , (a, b) and (b, b) in the case that these boundaries are natural. (The asymptotics when a is regular or exit and when b is entrance were covered in the previous cases.)

Case iv: the vertex (b, b) with b being natural. Using (2.8) of Lemma 2.6,

$$\liminf_{(y, z) \rightarrow (b, b)} F_0(y, z) \geq \liminf_{(y, z) \rightarrow (b, b)} \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} = c_0(b).$$

Thus the infimum does not occur in the limit as $(y, z) \rightarrow (b, b)$ since $(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$ of Condition 4.6(b,ii) satisfies $F_0(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) < c_0(b)$.

Case v: the vertex (a, a) with a being natural. This argument is essentially the same as for the vertex (b, b) using Lemma 2.6 and Condition 4.6(a,ii).

Case vi: the vertex (a, b) with both boundaries being natural. We examine models in which $a > -\infty$ and $b < \infty$ with $c_0(a), c_0(b) < \infty$; the situation when $c_0(a) = \infty$ or $c_0(b) = \infty$ follows a similar line of reasoning using the definition of a limit being ∞ . Note that both Condition 4.6(a,ii) and (b,ii) hold.

Choose ϵ such that $0 < \epsilon < (c_0(a) - F_0(\widehat{y}, \widehat{z})) \wedge (c_0(b) - F_0(\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{z}))$. Again, Lemma 2.6 establishes that there exists some $y_\epsilon, z_\epsilon \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

$$\frac{g_0(y_\epsilon) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)} \geq c_0(a) - \epsilon \quad \forall y \in (a, y_\epsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(z_\epsilon)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(z_\epsilon)} \geq c_0(b) - \epsilon \quad \forall z \in (z_\epsilon, b).$$

Thus for each y with $a < y < y_\epsilon$ and z such that $z_\epsilon < z < b$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(y, z) &\geq \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} \\ &= \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(z_\epsilon) + g_0(z_\epsilon) - g_0(y_\epsilon) + g_0(y_\epsilon) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} \\ &= \frac{g_0(z) - g_0(z_\epsilon)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(z_\epsilon)} \cdot \frac{\zeta(z) - \zeta(z_\epsilon)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} + \frac{g_0(z_\epsilon) - g_0(y_\epsilon)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} + \frac{g_0(y_\epsilon) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)} \cdot \frac{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} \\ &\geq [c_0(b) - \epsilon] \cdot \frac{\zeta(z) - \zeta(z_\epsilon)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} + \frac{g_0(z_\epsilon) - g_0(y_\epsilon)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} + [c_0(a) - \epsilon] \cdot \frac{\zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} \\ &\geq [(c_0(a) - \epsilon) \wedge (c_0(b) - \epsilon)] \cdot \frac{\zeta(z) - \zeta(z_\epsilon) + \zeta(y_\epsilon) - \zeta(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{(y,z) \rightarrow (a,b)} (\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)) = \infty$, it follows that

$$\liminf_{(y,z) \rightarrow (a,b)} F_0(y, z) \geq [(c_0(a) - \epsilon) \wedge (c_0(b) - \epsilon)] > F_0(\overline{y}, \overline{z}) \wedge F_0(\widetilde{y}, \widetilde{z}). \quad (4.19)$$

Therefore the infimum of F_0 is not obtained in the limit as $(y, z) \rightarrow (a, b)$.

In summary, we have established that there exists some $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$ which minimizes F_0 . $\square$

Combining the results in Proposition 4.3 and Theorem 4.8 establishes that, when the optimization is restricted to (y, z) ordering policies, the minimal cost is achieved by the (y_0^*, z_0^*) ordering policy and has an optimal value of F_0^* .

Corollary 4.9. *Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3 and 4.6 hold and let (y_0^*, z_0^*) denote a minimizing pair for the function F . Then the ordering policy (τ^*, Y^*) defined using (y_0^*, z_0^*) in (4.1) is optimal in the class of all (s, S) ordering policies with corresponding optimal value of $F_0^* = F_0(y_0^*, z_0^*) = J_0(\tau^*, Y^*)$.*

5 Auxiliary Function G_0

We now seek to extend the *optimality* of the (y_0^*, z_0^*) policy to the class $\mathcal{A}_0$. To do so, we impose Condition 4.6 so $F_0^* = F_0(y_0^*, z_0^*)$ for some $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$. Recall, Condition 2.3 requires continuity of c_0 at the boundary, even for finite, natural boundaries; c_0 may take value ∞ at the boundaries.

Define the auxiliary function G_0 on $\mathcal{E}$ by

$$G_0 = g_0 - F_0^* \zeta \quad (5.1)$$

and observe that $G_0 \in C(\mathcal{E}) \cap C^2(I)$. Moreover, G_0 extends uniquely to $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ due to the existence of $(\hat{y}, \hat{z})$ and $(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$ in Condition 4.6 or c_0 being infinite at the boundaries. This observation follows immediately when a is attainable and when b is an entrance boundary since ζ is finite in these cases. When a or b are natural boundaries, Lemma 2.6 combined with Condition 4.6 shows that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} G_0(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} (g_0(x) - F_0^* \zeta(x)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} \left(\frac{g_0(x)}{\zeta(x)} - F_0^* \right) \zeta(x) = -\infty$$

and similarly $\lim_{x \rightarrow b} G_0(x) = \infty$. The function G_0 satisfies an important system of relations.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3 and 4.6 hold and let G_0 be as in (5.1). Then G_0 is a solution of the system*

$$\begin{cases} Af(x) + c_0(x) - F_0^* = 0, & x \in \mathcal{I}, \\ Bf(y, z) + c_1(y, z) \geq 0, & (y, z) \in \mathcal{R} \\ f(x_0) = 0, \\ Bf(y_0^*, z_0^*) + c_1(y_0^*, z_0^*) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the first relation extends by continuity to $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$.

Proof. The identity involving AG_0 follows immediately from the definition of G_0 and the facts that $Ag_0 = -c_0$ and $A\zeta = -1$ while $G_0(x_0) = 0$ is trivially true. The extension to $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is immediate due to the continuity of c_0 on $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ in Condition 2.3(a). Next observe that

$$\begin{aligned} BG_0(y, z) &= g_0(z) - F_0^* \zeta(z) - (g_0(y) - F_0^* \zeta(y)) \\ &= g_0(z) - g_0(y) - \left(\frac{c_1(y_0^*, z_0^*) + g_0(z_0^*) - g_0(y_0^*)}{\zeta(z_0^*) - \zeta(y_0^*)} \right) (\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)) \\ &\geq g_0(z) - g_0(y) - \left(\frac{c_1(y, z) + g_0(z) - g_0(y)}{\zeta(y) - \zeta(y)} \right) (\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)) \\ &= -c_1(y, z) \end{aligned}$$

with equality holding at (y_0^*, z_0^*) , establishing the result for BG_0 . $\square$

5.1 Transversality involving G_0 for (s, S) policies

As a digression to illuminate the definitions of g_0 and ζ , the next proposition establishes an important transversality condition involving G_0 with the ensuing remark providing further clarification.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{I}$ be fixed. For $a < y < z < b$, let (τ, Y) be the (y, z) ordering policy defined by (4.1) and X satisfy (1.2). Define the process $\widetilde{M}$ by*

$$\widetilde{M}(t) := \int_0^t \sigma(X(s)) G_0'(X(s)) dW(s), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (5.2)$$

Then there exists a localizing sequence $\{\beta_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of stopping times such that for each n , $\widetilde{M}(\cdot \wedge \beta_n)$ is a martingale and the following transversality condition holds:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[G_0(X(t \wedge \beta_n))] = 0. \quad (5.3)$$

In addition, defining μ_0 to have the density π of (4.2) and μ_1 to place point mass $\frac{1}{B\zeta(y,z)}$ on $\{(y, z)\}$ (c.f. Proposition 4.1), we have

$$\int AG_0(x) \mu_0(dx) + \int BG_0(y, z) \mu_1(dy \times dz) = 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. Let (y, z) , (τ, Y) and X be as in the statement of the proposition. Let $\{b_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathcal{I}$ be a strictly increasing sequence such that $x_0 \vee z \leq b_1$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = b$ and define the sequence of localizing times $\{\beta_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by $\beta_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X(t) = b_n\}$. Using Itô's formula, it follows that for each n ,

$$\begin{aligned} G_0(X(t \wedge \beta_n)) &= G_0(x_0) + \int_0^{t \wedge \beta_n} AG_0(X(s)) ds + \int_0^{t \wedge \beta_n} \sigma(X(s)) G'_0(X(s)) dW(s) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t \wedge \beta_n\}} BG_0(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)); \end{aligned}$$

note that no local time term is included in this identity when a is a reflecting boundary since $y > a$ implies that the process X never hits a . Taking expectations and using the fact that $AG_0 = F_0^* - c_0$, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G_0(X(t \wedge \beta_n))] &= G_0(x_0) + F_0^* \mathbb{E}[t \wedge \beta_n] - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \beta_n} c_0(X(s)) ds \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t \wedge \beta_n\}} BG_0(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Since b is inaccessible from the interior and $z < b$, it follows that $\beta_n \rightarrow \infty$ (a.s.) as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Applying the monotone and dominated convergence theorems, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[G_0(X(t \wedge \beta_n))] &= G_0(x_0) + F_0^* t - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t c_0(X(s)) ds \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t\}} BG_0(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \right] \\ &= G_0(x_0) + F_0^* t - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t c_0(X(s)) ds \right] + BG_0(y, z) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t\}} \right] \\ &\quad + (BG_0(x_0, z) - BG_0(y, z)) \mathbb{E}[I_{\{\tau_1=0\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

Divide by t and let $t \rightarrow \infty$. By (4.3) of Proposition 4.1 and Remark 4.4, respectively, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t\}} \right] = \frac{1}{B\zeta(y, z)} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t c_0(X(s)) ds \right] = \frac{Bg_0(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)}.$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[G_0(X(t \wedge \beta_n))] = F_0^* - \frac{Bg_0(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)} + \frac{Bg_0(y, z) - F_0^* B\zeta(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)} = 0.$$

Using the definitions of $\mu_{0,t}$ and $\mu_{1,t}$ in (3.1), this argument establishes that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int AG_0(x) \mu_{0,t}(dx) + \int BG_0(y, z) \mu_{1,t}(dy \times dz) \right] = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

By (4.6) of Remark 4.4 and the definition of weak convergence,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int AG_0(x) \mu_{0,t}(dx) = \int AG_0(x) \mu_0(dx). \quad (5.7)$$

When $x_0 < y$, $\mu_{1,t}$ places mass on $\{(x_0, z), (y, z)\}$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{1,t}(\{(x_0, z)\}) = 0$; otherwise $\mu_{1,t}$ only places mass on $\{(y, z)\}$. This implies $\mu_{1,t} \Rightarrow \mu_1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which in turn implies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int BG_0(y, z) \mu_{1,t}(dy \times dz) = \int BG_0(y, z) \mu_1(dy \times dz). \quad (5.8)$$

Combining (5.6), (5.7) and (5.8) establishes (5.4). $\square$

Remark 5.3. By definition, the functions g_0 and ζ are solutions of $Af = -c_0$ and $Af = -1$, respectively, for which $g_0(x_0) = 0 = \zeta(x_0)$. The choice of the function $G_0 = g_0 - F_0^* \zeta$ is the only C^2 solution of the inhomogeneous equation $Af = F_0^* - c_0$ with $f(x_0) = 0$ for which the transversality condition (5.3) in Proposition 5.2 holds. To see this, recall the scale function S of Condition 2.1 and the constant function are two linearly independent solutions to the homogeneous equation $Af = 0$. Define the function $\hat{S}(x) = S(x) - S(x_0)$ for $x \in \mathcal{E}$ so that $\hat{S}$ is a solution of $Af = 0$ with $\hat{S}(x_0) = 0$. Following the previous proof to (5.5) using $\hat{S}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{S}(X(t \wedge \beta_n))] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t \wedge \beta_n\}} B\hat{S}(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \right] \\ &= B\hat{S}(y, z) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t \wedge \beta_n\}} \right] + [B\hat{S}(x_0, z) - B\hat{S}(y, z)] \mathbb{E}[I_{\{\tau_k=0\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, dividing by t and letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[\hat{S}(X(t \wedge \beta_n))] = \frac{B\hat{S}(y, z)}{B\zeta(y, z)} = \frac{S(z) - S(y)}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)} > 0. \quad (5.9)$$

Observe that for $K \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{G}_0 = G_0 + K\hat{S}$ is the general solution to the inhomogeneous equation $Af = F_0^* - c_0$ with $f(x_0) = 0$. As a result of Proposition 5.2 and (5.9), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[\hat{G}_0(X(t \wedge \beta_n))] = \frac{K(S(z) - S(y))}{\zeta(z) - \zeta(y)}$$

and the transversality condition (5.3) fails for any $\hat{G}_0$ with non-zero K .

5.2 Optimality in the class $\mathcal{A}_0$

For (y, z) ordering policies, Proposition 5.2 shows that the corresponding limiting measures (μ_0, μ_1) of the pairs $\{(\mu_{0,t}, \mu_{1,t}) : t > 0\}$ satisfy (5.4). However for a general ordering policy $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$, the measures $\{\mu_{1,t}\}$ may not have weak limits as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We establish a limiting adjoint relation for a class of test functions $\mathcal{D}$, defined below, that is used to show that $J_0(\tau, Y) \geq F_0^*$ for any $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$.

Recall, Proposition 3.2 demonstrates that the measures $\{\mu_{0,t}\}$ are tight (as $t \rightarrow \infty$) whenever $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$. It follows that any weak limit μ_0 will have support in $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$. However, when $c_0(a) = \infty$ or $c_0(b) = \infty$, $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$ implies that each limiting measure μ_0 places no mass on the corresponding boundary.

We begin by identifying a particular class of test functions that plays a key role in the analysis.

Definition 5.4. A function f is in $\mathcal{D}$ provided it satisfies

- (a) $f \in C(\bar{\mathcal{E}}) \cap C^2(\mathcal{I})$ and there exists $L_f < \infty$ such that
 - (i) $|f| \leq L_f$;
 - (ii) $(\sigma f')^2 \leq L_f(1 + c_0)$;
 - (iii) $|Af| \leq L_f$;
- (b)
 - (i) for all models, at each boundary where c_0 is finite, Af extends continuously to the boundary with a finite value;
 - (ii) when a is a reflecting boundary, $|f'(a)| < \infty$; and
 - (iii) when a is a sticky boundary and $c_0(a) < \infty$, $\sigma f'$ extends continuously at a to a finite value.

As pointed out at the end of Section 3, any policy (τ, Y) which allows X to stick at a with positive probability when $c_0(a) = \infty$ has $J_0(\tau, Y) = \infty$ so is clearly not optimal. Thus the stickiness of a is only of concern when $c_0(a) < \infty$, in which case Definition 5.4(b,i) and (b,iii) is required for our analysis.

Proposition 5.5. Let $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ with $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$ and let X satisfy (1.2). For $t > 0$, define $(\mu_{0,t}, \mu_{1,t})$ by (3.1) and let μ_0 be such that $\mu_{0,t_j} \Rightarrow \mu_0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for some sequence $\{t_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} t_j = \infty$. Then the limiting adjoint relation

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \int Af(x) \mu_0(dx) + \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int Bf(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) = 0 \quad (5.10)$$

holds.

Remark 5.6. For policies (τ, Y) with $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$, Proposition 3.2 only establishes tightness of the average expected occupation measures $\{\mu_{0,t}\}$ but not tightness of the average expected ordering measures $\{\mu_{1,t}\}$. Ordering policies for which the collection $\{\mu_{1,t}\}$ is tight as $t \rightarrow \infty$ will have weak limits. For any pair (μ_0, μ_1) with $(\mu_{0,t_j}, \mu_{1,t_j}) \Rightarrow (\mu_0, \mu_1)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, (5.10) is more simply expressed as

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \int Af(x) \mu_0(dx) + \int Bf(y, z) \mu_1(dy \times dz) = 0.$$

Proof. Let (τ, Y) , X , $\{t_j\}$, $\{(\mu_{0,t_j}, \mu_{1,t_j})\}$ and μ_0 be as in the statement of the proposition. The following analysis considers the case of a being a reflecting boundary; when a is not reflecting, the local time term is omitted. For each $f \in \mathcal{D}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, Itô's formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} f(X(t_j)) &= f(x_0) + \int_0^{t_j} Af(X(s)) ds + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t_j\}} Bf(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_j} \sigma(X(s)) f'(X(s)) dW(s) + f'(a) L_a(t_j). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for each t_j ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t_j} (\sigma(X(s)) f'(X(s)))^2 ds \right] \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t_j} L_f[1 + c_0(X(s))] ds \right] < \infty$$

so $\sigma f' \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, t_j])$ and the stochastic integral has mean 0. Thus taking expectations and dividing by t_j yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{t_j} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [f(X(t_j))] \\ &= \frac{f(x_0)}{t_j} + \int_{\mathcal{E}} Af(x) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx) + \int_{\mathcal{R}} Bf(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) + f'(a) \frac{\mathbb{E}[L_a(t_j)]}{t_j} \\ &= \frac{f(x_0)}{t_j} + \int_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}} Af(x) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx) + \int_{\mathcal{R}} Bf(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) + f'(a) \frac{\mathbb{E}[L_a(t_j)]}{t_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Since by the definition of $\mathcal{D}$, the function $f \in C(\mathcal{E}) \cap C^2(\mathcal{I})$ is bounded, implying Bf is also bounded and continuous, Af is bounded and continuous, and $f'(a)$ is finite, upon letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain

$$\int Af(x) \mu_0(dx) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int Bf(y, z) \mu_{1,t}(dy \times dz) = 0;$$

the existence of the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ follows from the limits existing for the other terms in (5.11). Notice, in particular, that μ_0 places no mass on boundaries where c_0 is infinite so the weak convergence argument does not require Af to extend continuously at such boundaries (cf., Definition 5.4(b,i)). When a is a sticky boundary, however, the extensions in Definition 5.4(b,i) and (b,iii) are required to apply Itô's formula. $\square$

Corollary 5.7. *Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3 and 4.6. Suppose $G_0 \in \mathcal{D}$. Then for every $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $J(\tau, Y) \geq F_0^*$ and hence the (y_0^*, z_0^*) ordering policy is optimal in the class $\mathcal{A}_0$.*

Proof. Let $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$, X satisfy (1.2) and let $\{t_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence such that

$$J(\tau, Y) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_j} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t_j} c_0(X(s)) ds + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t_j\}} c_1(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \right].$$

By considering a subsequence, if necessary, let $\mu_{0,t_j} \Rightarrow \mu_0$ for some $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\overline{\mathcal{E}})$. The combination of Theorem 5.1 and Proposition 5.5 immediately implies that

$$J(\tau, Y) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int c_0(x) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx) + \int c_1(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int (AG_0(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx) + \int (BG_0(y, z) + c_1(y, z)) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \right) \\
&\geq \int F_0^* \mu_0(dx) = F_0^*
\end{aligned}$$

and thus the (y_0^*, z_0^*) ordering policy is optimal in the general class $\mathcal{A}_0$. $\square$

In general $G_0 \notin \mathcal{D}$ so it is necessary to approximate G_0 by functions in $\mathcal{D}$ and pass to a limit. Interestingly, the following analysis works with the approximating functions G_n defined in Lemma 5.9 without establishing an adjoint relation involving the function G_0 . To achieve the desired result, we impose another set of conditions. First, recall that when a or b are natural boundaries, the existence of the limits $G_0(a) := \lim_{x \rightarrow a} G_0(x)$ and $G_0(b) := \lim_{x \rightarrow b} G_0(x)$ follow from Condition 4.6 since G_0 is strictly decreasing in a neighbourhood of a and is strictly increasing in a neighbourhood of b .

Condition 5.8. Let G_0 be as defined in (5.1).

(a) There exists some $L < \infty$ and some $y_1 > a$ such that

(i) for models having $c_0(a) = \infty$,

$$\frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} + \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^3} \leq L, \quad a < x < y_1;$$

(ii) for models in which $c_0(a) < \infty$, there is some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^{2+\epsilon}} \leq L, \quad a \leq x < y_1.$$

(b) There exists some $L < \infty$ and some $z_1 < b$ such that

(i) for models having $c_0(b) = \infty$,

$$\frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} + \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)(1 + c_0(x))} \leq L, \quad z_1 < x < b;$$

(ii) for models in which $c_0(b) < \infty$, there is some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^{2+\epsilon}} + \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)(1 + c_0(x))} \leq L, \quad z_1 < x \leq b.$$

- (c) (i) When $G_0(a) > -\infty$, or when a is a sticky boundary with $c_0(a) < \infty$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \sigma(x)G'_0(x)$ exists and is finite; and
(ii) when $G_0(b) < \infty$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow b} \sigma(x)G'_0(x)$ exists and is finite.

First note that the bound in Condition 5.8(b,i) at the boundary b is more restrictive than the similar bound in Condition 5.8(a,i) at a since

$$\frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^3} = \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)(1 + c_0(x))} \cdot \frac{1 + c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} \leq L(1 + L). \quad (5.12)$$

The need for tighter restrictions at the boundary b than at a is not unexpected since there is no way to control the process from diffusing upwards whereas ordering can prevent the process from diffusing towards a .

The reason for having two different conditions in Condition 5.8(a,b) based on whether c_0 at the boundary is finite or infinite is that any limiting pair of measures (μ_0, μ_1) arising from an admissible policy (τ, Y) having finite cost $J_0(\tau, Y)$ must place no μ_0 -mass at a boundary where c_0 is infinite. A weak limit μ_0 may have positive mass at a boundary when c_0 is finite. Also notice the subtle assumption in Condition 5.8(a,ii) and (b,ii) that the bounds extend to the boundary whereas there is no assumption needed at the boundary in Condition 5.8(a,i) and (b,i).

Now define the elementary function h on $\mathbb{R}$ which is central to the approximation of G_0 :

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{8}x^4 + \frac{3}{4}x^2 + \frac{3}{8}, & \text{for } |x| \leq 1, \\ |x|, & \text{for } |x| \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $h > 0$. For later reference, we observe that h has the following properties on $\mathbb{R}$:

- $0 \leq h(x) - xh'(x) \leq \frac{3}{8}$ so for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 + \frac{1}{n}(h(x) - xh'(x)) \leq 1 + \frac{3}{8n} \leq 2$;
- $h(x) + xh'(x) \geq 0$;
- $h(x) \geq |x|$; and
- $h''(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h''(x) = 0$ for $|x| \geq 1$.

Lemma 5.9. Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3, 4.6 and 5.8 with G_0 defined by (5.1). For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the function G_n by

$$G_n = \frac{G_0}{1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0)}. \quad (5.13)$$

Then $G_n \in \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ arbitrarily. To show that G_n is bounded, notice first that on the set $\{x \in \mathcal{E} : |G_0(x)| < 1\}$,

$$|G_n(x)| = \frac{|G_0(x)|}{1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x))} < 1.$$

On the set $\{x \in \mathcal{E} : |G_0(x)| \geq 1\}$, we have

$$|G_n(x)| = \frac{n}{\frac{n}{|G_0(x)|} + 1} \leq n.$$

Combining these estimates indicates that $|G_n(x)| \leq n$. In addition, when a and b are finite and natural, $G_0(x) \rightarrow \pm\infty$ implies $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} G_n(x) = -n$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow b} G_n(x) = n$, respectively, so we may define G_n at such boundaries to be the appropriate limiting value.

Straightforward calculations establish that for $x \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} G'_n(x) &= \frac{G'_0(x)[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2}, \quad \text{and} \\ G''_n(x) &= \frac{G''_0(x)[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} - \frac{(G'_0(x))^2 G_0(x)h''(G_0(x))}{n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{2(G'_0(x))^2 h'(G_0(x))[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

Observe that

$$(\sigma(x)G'_n(x))^2 = \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(n + h(G_0(x)))^3} \cdot \frac{n^3[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]^2}{1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x))}.$$

By Condition 5.8 (and (5.12) when necessary), there exist $y_1 > a$, $z_1 < b$ and $L < \infty$ such that the first factor is bounded for all $x \in [y_1, z_1]^c$. The continuity of this factor implies it is also bounded on $[y_1, z_1]$. Since the second factor is bounded by $4n^3$, $(\sigma G'_n)^2$ is bounded.

Next, we show that AG_n is bounded. Using the expressions for G'_n and G''_n , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} AG_n(x) &= \frac{AG_0(x)[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} - \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2 G_0(x)h''(G_0(x))}{2n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2 h'(G_0(x))[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^3} \\ &=: AG_n^{(1)}(x) + e_n^{(2)}(x) + e_n^{(3)}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

We examine these terms carefully. Recall, $AG_0(x) = F_0^* - c_0(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{I}$.

Consider first the case in which $c_0(a) = \infty$; $c_0(b) = \infty$ is handled similarly so is omitted. Let $y_1 > a$ be as in Condition 5.8(a,i). For $x \leq y_1$ such that $|G_0(x)| \geq 1$, $h(G_0(x)) = |G_0(x)|$ and $h''(G_0(x)) = 0$ so $AG_n^{(1)}(x)$ and $e_n^{(3)}(x)$ are uniformly bounded due to Condition 5.8(a,i) while $e_n^{(2)}(x) = 0$. For $x \leq y_1$ such that $|G_0(x)| < 1$, Condition 5.8(a,i) implies that both $c_0(x)$ and $(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2$ are uniformly bounded. Since $h(x)$ and $h''(x)$ are also uniformly bounded for $|x| < 1$, it follows that AG_n is bounded on (a, y_1) .

Now consider the case in which $c_0(a) < \infty$; again, the case $c_0(b) < \infty$ is handled similarly. $AG_n^{(1)}$ remains bounded on $[a, y_1]$ since continuity of c_0 at a implies there is some neighbourhood $[a, y_2]$ of a such that $\left| \frac{2(F_0^* - c_0(x))}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} \right| \leq 2c_0(a) + 2F_0^* + 1$ for $x \in [a, y_2]$. When $y_2 < y_1$, continuity implies $AG_n^{(1)}$ remains bounded on $[y_2, y_1]$. Essentially the same analysis as above but using Condition 5.8(a,ii) handles $e_n^{(2)}$ and $e_n^{(3)}$ on (a, y_1) . Thus AG_n is bounded in (a, y_1) and this relation extends to include $x = a$.

Similar arguments with regard to the boundary b show that AG_n is bounded in (z_1, b) , extending to include b under Condition 5.8(b,ii) when $c_0(b) < \infty$. By continuity, AG_n is bounded on $[y_1, z_1]$, establishing that AG_n is bounded.

We now verify the boundary behaviour of Definition 5.4. Regarding AG_n , we must show it is continuous at finite natural boundaries for which c_0 is finite. We examine the boundary a ; the analysis for b is similar. If $|G_0(a)| < \infty$, then Condition 5.8(c) implies $AG_n(a) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} AG_n(x)$ exists and is finite. Now consider the case in which $|G_0(a)| = \infty$. Then for x sufficiently small (without loss of generality $x \leq y_1$), $|G_0(x)| \geq 1$ so $h(G_0(x)) = |G_0(x)|$ and $h''(G_0(x)) = 0$. It then immediately follows that $e_n^{(2)}(x) = 0$ while $AG_n^{(1)}(x)$ converges to 0. For $e_n^{(3)}(x)$, Condition 5.8(a,ii) implies that for $x \leq y_1$,

$$\frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^3} \leq \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}|G_0(x)|)^{2+\epsilon}} \cdot \frac{1}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}|G_0(x)|)^{1-\epsilon}}$$

which again converges to 0 as $x \rightarrow a$. Thus defining $AG_n(a) = 0$ makes AG_n continuous at a .

Now, consider the case of a being a reflecting boundary. Using the definitions of g_0 , ζ and G_0 in (2.4), (2.5) and (5.1), respectively, it follows that

$$G'_0(x) = s(x) \int_x^b 2(c_0(v) - F_0^*) dM(v).$$

Conditions 2.1(b,i) and (2.2) of 2.3(a) then imply that $|G'_0(a)| < \infty$. From the expression for $G'_n(x)$ in (5.14), $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} G'_n(x)$ exists and is finite.

Finally, when a is a sticky boundary and $c_0(a) < \infty$, Condition 5.8(c,i) along with (5.14) establishes that Definition 5.4(b,iii) holds. $\square$

We now examine the convergences of AG_n and BG_n .

Lemma 5.10. *Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3, 4.6 and 5.8. Let G_n be as defined in (5.13). Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} AG_n(x) = AG_0(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{I}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} BG_n(y, z) = BG_0(y, z) \quad \forall (y, z) \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}.$$

Moreover, at each boundary where c_0 is finite, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} AG_n \geq AG_0$.

Proof. We consider the convergence of G_n first. For all $x \in \mathcal{I}$, $|G_0(x)| < \infty$, so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G_0(x)}{1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x))} = G_0(x).$$

This result holds also at the boundaries whenever G_0 is bounded there.

Now consider the case in which $|G_0(a)| = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} |G_0(x)| = \infty$. Observe that for $x \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$G_0(x) = \int_{x_0}^x \int_u^b 2[c_0(v) - F_0^*] dM(v) dS(u). \quad (5.16)$$

When a is attainable, $\zeta(a) > -\infty$ so if c_0 were bounded in a neighbourhood of a , G_0 would also be bounded in the neighbourhood. Thus $c_0(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow a$ and as a result, $G_0(a) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} G_0(x) = -\infty$. When a is a natural boundary, $\zeta(a) = -\infty$ and Condition 4.6 implies $c_0(a) > F_0^*$ so again $G_0(a) = -\infty$. Then regardless of the type of boundary, for x sufficiently close to a , $G_0(x) \leq -1$. Since $h(x) = |x|$ on the set where $|x| \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} G_n(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{G_0(x)}{1 + \frac{1}{n}|G_0(x)|} = -n =: G_n(a)$$

so again $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_n(a) = -\infty = G_0(a)$.

A similar argument at the boundary b establishes that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_n(b) = G_0(b)$ and therefore G_n converges pointwise to G_0 . It is therefore immediate that BG_n converges pointwise to BG_0 on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$.

Turning to AG_n , for $x \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\begin{aligned} AG_n(x) = & \frac{AG_0(x)[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} - \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2 G_0(x)h''(G_0(x))}{2n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} \\ & - \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2 h'(G_0(x))[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^3} \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

and since $G_0 \in C^2(\mathcal{I})$, $G_0(x)$ and $G'_0(x)$ are finite. It then follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} AG_n(x) = AG_0(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{I}$. A careful examination of the convergence at the boundaries is required.

Assume c_0 is finite at the boundaries. When $|G_0(a)| < \infty$, Condition 5.8(c) implies $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \sigma(x)G'_0(x) = K_1$ for some finite K_1 . Therefore, setting $AG_0(a) = F_0^* - c_0(a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow a} AG_n(x) = & \frac{AG_0(a)[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(a)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(a)h'(G_0(a))]}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(a)))^2} - \frac{K_1^2 G_0(a)h''(G_0(a))}{2n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(a)))^2} \\ & - \frac{K_1^2 h'(G_0(a))[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(a)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(a)h'(G_0(a))]}{n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(a)))^3} \\ =: & AG_n(a) \end{aligned}$$

As before, it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} AG_n(a) = AG_0(a)$. A similar analysis applies at the boundary b when $|G_0(b)| < \infty$. Observe that, under the assumption that c_0 is finite at the boundaries, G_0 is bounded at the boundaries when a is attainable and when b is an entrance boundary.

Now consider the case in which $c_0(a) < \infty$ and $|G_0(a)| = \infty$. Thus a is a natural boundary and hence Condition 4.6 implies that $G_0(a) = -\infty$. Then for some $y_1 > a$, $G_0(x) \leq -1$ for all $a < x < y_1$ and as a result, $h(G_0(x)) = |G_0(x)|$ and $h''(G_0(x)) = 0$. Examining the expression for AG_n , we see

$$AG_n(x) = \frac{AG_0(x)}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}|G_0(x)|)^2} - \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2 \operatorname{sgn}(G_0(x))}{n(1 + \frac{1}{n}|G_0(x)|)^3}.$$

Since $AG_0(x) = F_0^* - c_0(x)$, $c_0(a) < \infty$ and $|G_0(a)| = \infty$, the first term converges to 0 as $x \rightarrow a$. Using Condition 5.8(a,ii), we have

$$\left| \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2 \operatorname{sgn}(G_0(x))}{n(1 + \frac{1}{n}|G_0(x)|)^3} \right| \leq \frac{Ln^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^{1-\epsilon}}$$

so this term also converges to 0 as $x \rightarrow a$. Therefore $AG_n(a) = 0$ and it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} AG_n(a) = 0 > F_0^* - c_0(a) = AG_0(a)$. A similar argument using Condition 5.8(b,ii) establishes that $AG_n(b) \geq AG_0(b)$ for each n when $|G_0(b)| = \infty$. $\square$

The following proposition gives the first important result involving AG_n and c_0 .

Proposition 5.11. *Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3, 4.6 and 5.8 hold. Let $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ with $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$, X satisfy (1.2), $\mu_{0,t}$ be defined by (3.1) and let μ_0 be any weak limit of $\{\mu_{0,t}\}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Define G_n by (5.13). Then*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int (AG_n(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_0(dx) \geq \int (AG_0(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_0(dx) \geq F_0^*.$$

Proof. Let (τ, Y) , $\{\mu_{0,t}\}$ and μ_0 be as in the statement of the proposition. Using (5.15), write $AG_n = AG_n^{(1)} + e_n^{(2)} + e_n^{(3)}$. Thus for $x \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\begin{aligned} AG_n^{(1)}(x) + c_0(x) &= (-c_0(x) + F_0^*) \frac{[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} + c_0(x) \\ &= c_0(x) \frac{\frac{1}{n^2}(h(G_0(x)))^2 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) + \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} \\ &\quad + F_0^* \frac{[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))]}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2}. \end{aligned}$$

As noted earlier, h satisfies $h(x) + xh'(x) > 0$ and $0 \leq h(x) - xh'(x) \leq \frac{3}{8}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus both terms in the rewritten expression for $AG_n^{(1)}(x) + c_0(x)$ are positive. When $c_0(a)$ or $c_0(b)$ are infinite, the limiting measure μ_0 does not place any mass at a or b . When either $c_0(a)$ or $c_0(b)$ is finite, the relation $AG_n^{(1)}(x) + c_0(x) > 0$ still holds at $x = a$ or b , respectively. Therefore Fatou's lemma implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}} (AG_n^{(1)}(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_0(dx) \\ &\geq \int_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (AG_n^{(1)}(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_0(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{E}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (AG_n^{(1)}(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_0(dx) + \int_{\overline{\mathcal{E}} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (AG_n^{(1)}(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_0(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Recall, $AG_0 = F_0^* - c_0$ and $|G_0(x)| < \infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{I}$. For all $x \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}$ with $|G_0(x)| < \infty$, it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} AG_n^{(1)}(x) = F_0^*$. Turning to the boundary a , when $|G_0(a)| = \infty$ and $c_0(a) < \infty$, then $AG_n^{(1)}(a) = 0$ and hence Condition 4.6(a,ii) implies that $AG_n^{(1)}(a) + c_0(a) > F_0^*$. A similar observation applies to the right boundary b when $|G_0(b)| = \infty$. Therefore it follows that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}} (AG_n^{(1)}(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_0(dx) \geq \int_{\mathcal{E}} F_0^* \mu_0(dx) + \int_{\overline{\mathcal{E}} \setminus \mathcal{E}} F_0^* \mu_0(dx) = F_0^*. \quad (5.18)$$

Now consider the term $e_n^{(2)}$. Recall, $h''(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|x| \geq 1$. When $|G_0(a)| = \infty$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} e_n^{(2)}(x) = 0$; when $|G_0(a)| < \infty$, it follows from Condition 5.8(c)

that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} e_n^{(2)}(x)$ exists and is finite. A similar analysis applies to the right boundary b . From the definition of $e_n^{(2)}$, it therefore follows that $|e_n^{(2)}(x)| \leq \frac{K}{n} \leq K < \infty$ uniformly in x and n . Thus the bounded convergence theorem implies that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}} e_n^{(2)}(x) \mu_0(dx) = \int_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n^{(2)}(x) \mu_0(dx) = 0. \quad (5.19)$$

It remains to analyze the term $e_n^{(3)}(x)$. If $|G_0(a)| = \infty$, then as argued in the proof of Lemma 5.10, we must have $G_0(a) = -\infty$. Consequently there exists some $y_1 > a$ such that $G_0(x) < 0$ for all $a \leq x < y_1$. Thus on (a, y_1) , $h'(G_0(x)) < 0$ and $e_n^{(3)}(x) \geq 0$ and these relations extend by continuity to a . Applying Fatou's lemma, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[a, y_1]} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx) \geq \int_{[a, y_1]} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx) \geq 0. \quad (5.20)$$

If $|G_0(a)| < \infty$, then Condition 5.8(c) implies that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \sigma(x)G_0'(x)$ exists and is finite. This, together with the fact that $h'(x)[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(x) - \frac{1}{n}xh'(x)]$ is uniformly bounded for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, implies that there exist a positive constant K and some $y_1 > a$ such that $|e_n^{(3)}(x)| \leq \frac{K}{n} \leq K$ for all $a \leq x < y_1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As a result, (5.20) still holds (with “ $\geq$ ” replaced by “ $=$ ”) by virtue of the bounded convergence theorem. For all $x \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}$, $|h'(G_0(x))|[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)) - \frac{1}{n}G_0(x)h'(G_0(x))] \leq 2$ so by Condition 5.8(b) there exists some $z_1 < b$ such that for all $z_1 < x \leq b$,

$$\begin{aligned} |e_n^{(3)}(x)| &\leq \frac{2(\sigma(x)G_0'(x))^2}{n(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^3} \\ &= \frac{2(\sigma(x)G_0'(x))^2}{(n + |G_0(x)|)(1 + c_0(x))} \cdot \frac{1 + c_0(x)}{(1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(x)))^2} \\ &\leq 2L(1 + c_0(x)). \end{aligned}$$

The function $(1 + c_0(x))$ is integrable with respect to μ_0 and hence the dominated convergence theorem implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{(z_1, b]} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx) = \int_{(z_1, b]} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx).$$

It is immediate from the definition of $e_n^{(3)}$ that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n^{(3)}(x) = 0$ for $x \in (z_1, b)$; this limit also holds when $c_0(b) < \infty$ and $G_0(b) < \infty$. When $c_0(b) < \infty$ and $G_0(b) = \infty$, then continuity of $e_n^{(3)}$ along with Condition 5.8(b) implies that $e_n^{(3)}(b) = \lim_{x \rightarrow b} e_n^{(3)}(x) = 0$. When $c_0(b) = \infty$, then μ_0 places no mass at b . Thus the dominated convergence theorem again implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{(z_1, b]} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx) = \int_{(z_1, b]} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx) = 0. \quad (5.21)$$

Continuity implies that there exists some $K < \infty$ such that $(\sigma(x)G_0'(x))^2 < K$ on the interval $[y_1, z_1]$ so $|e_n^{(3)}(x)| < \frac{2K}{n} \leq 2K$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n^{(3)}(x) = 0$. Thus the bounded convergence theorem also implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[y_1, z_1]} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx) = \int_{[y_1, z_1]} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx) = 0. \quad (5.22)$$

Combining (5.20)–(5.22) yields

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\bar{\mathcal{E}}} e_n^{(3)}(x) \mu_0(dx) \geq 0. \quad (5.23)$$

In light of (5.17), the result now follows from (5.18), (5.19), and (5.23). $\square$

We next establish a similar result involving BG_n and c_1 , though the lack of tightness of $\{\mu_{1,t}\}$ means that the result cannot be expressed in terms of a limiting measure μ_1 .

Proposition 5.12. *Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3, 4.6 and 5.8 hold. Let $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ with $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$ and X satisfy (1.2). Let $\{t_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} t_j = \infty$ and*

$$J_0(\tau, Y) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_j} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t_j} c_0(X(s)) ds + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t_j\}} c_1(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \right].$$

For each j , define μ_{1,t_j} by (3.1) and define G_n by (5.13). Then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int (BG_n(y, z) + c_1(y, z)) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \geq 0.$$

Proof. Let (τ, Y) , X and $\{t_j\}$ be as in the statement of the proposition. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} BG_n(y, z) &= \frac{G_0(z)}{1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))} - \frac{G_0(y)}{1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(y))} \\ &= \frac{BG_0(y, z)}{[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))][1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(y))]} + \frac{G_0(z)h(G_0(y)) - G_0(y)h(G_0(z))}{n[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))][1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(y))]}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

Adding in c_1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} BG_n(y, z) + c_1(y, z) &= \frac{BG_0(y, z) + c_1(y, z)}{[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))][1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(y))]} \\ &\quad + c_1(y, z) \left(1 - \frac{1}{[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))][1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(y))]} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{G_0(z)h(G_0(y)) - G_0(y)h(G_0(z))}{n[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))][1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(y))]} \\ &\geq \frac{G_0(z)h(G_0(y)) - G_0(y)h(G_0(z))}{n[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))][1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(y))]} =: R_n(y, z); \end{aligned}$$

the first summand in the middle relation is positive due to Proposition 5.1 and the second summand is easily seen to be positive. Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int (BG_n + c_1)(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int R_n(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz).$$

We examine the double limit of the remainder term R_n in several cases. Recall, the convergence of c_0 to ∞ at the boundaries or the existence of $(\hat{y}, \hat{z})$ and $(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$ in Condition 4.6

implies the monotonicity of $G_0(x)$ in neighbourhoods of a and b and thus the existence of $G_0(a) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} G_0(x)$ in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ and similarly, the existence of $G_0(b) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Case (i): $G_0(a) > -\infty$ and $G_0(b) < \infty$. In this case, $|G_0(z)h(G_0(y)) - G_0(y)h(G_0(z))|$ is bounded by some $K < \infty$ and hence $|R_n(y, z)| \leq \frac{K}{n} \leq K$. Since $R_n(y, z) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$, the bounded convergence theorem yields

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int |R_n(y, z)| \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{K}{n} \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) = 0; \quad (5.25)$$

note in establishing this limit, we use the fact that

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{1,t_j}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k_1} \int c_1(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \leq \frac{J_0(\tau, Y)}{k_1} < \infty.$$

Case (ii): $G_0(a) = -\infty$ and $G_0(b) < \infty$. Since $G_0(a) = -\infty$, there exists some y_1 , with $y_1 > a$ such that $G_0(x) < -1$ for all $x < y_1$. Recall $h(x) = |x|$ on $(-\infty, -1)$ and $h(x) \geq |x|$ for all x . Thus it follows that for all $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$ with $y \leq y_1$,

$$R_n(y, z) = \frac{|G_0(y)|(G_0(z) + h(G_0(z)))}{n[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))][1 + \frac{1}{n}|G_0(y)|]} \geq 0.$$

Again since R_n is continuous and $G_0(b) < \infty$, there exists some $K < \infty$ such that $|R_n(y, z)| < \frac{K}{n} \leq K$ for all $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$ with $y_1 \leq y \leq z$. Thus letting $E_1 = \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{R} : a < y \leq y_1\}$ and $E_2 = \mathcal{R} \setminus E_1$, the bounded convergence theorem again implies

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{R}} R_n(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E_2} R_n(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) = 0.$$

Case (iii): $G_0(a) > -\infty$ and $G_0(b) = \infty$. Similarly to case (ii), there exists some z_1 with $z_1 < b$ such that $G_0(x) \geq 1$ for $z_1 < x < b$. Again, $h(x) \geq |x|$ for all x implies that for $(y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$ with $z > z_1$,

$$R_n(y, z) = \frac{G_0(z)(h(G_0(y)) - |G_0(y)|)}{n[1 + \frac{1}{n}h(G_0(z))][1 + \frac{1}{n}|G_0(y)|]} \geq 0.$$

Defining the set $E_3 = \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{R} : z > z_1\}$ and $E_4 = \mathcal{R} \setminus E_3$, there is some $K < \infty$ for which $|R_n| \leq \frac{K}{n} < K$ on E_4 so the bounded convergence theorem implies

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{R}} R_n(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E_4} R_n(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) = 0.$$

Case (iv): $G_0(a) = -\infty$ and $G_0(b) = \infty$. Let y_1, E_1, E_2, z_1, E_3 and E_4 be as in cases (ii) and (iii). We then have $R_n \geq 0$ on $E_1 \cup E_3$ and $|R_n| \leq \frac{K}{n}$ for some $K < \infty$ on $E_2 \cap E_4$. Thus

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{R}} R_n(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E_2 \cap E_4} R_n(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) = 0.$$

Since under every combination of asymptotics of G_0 at the boundaries, the integral of the remainder term vanishes in the double limit, the result is established. $\square$

The next theorem pulls these results together.

Theorem 5.13. *Assume Conditions 2.1, 2.3, 4.6 and 5.8 hold. Let $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ with $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$. Then*

$$J_0(\tau, Y) \geq F_0^* = F_0(y_0^*, z_0^*) = J(\tau^*, Y^*)$$

in which (τ^*, Y^*) is the ordering policy (4.1) using an optimizing pair $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$.

Proof. Let $(\tau, Y) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ satisfy $J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty$. Let X satisfy (1.2), $\mu_{0,t}$ and $\mu_{1,t}$ be defined by (3.1) for each $t > 0$. Let $\{t_j\}$ be a sequence with $t_j \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_0(\tau, Y) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_j} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t_j} c_0(X(s)) ds + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_{\{\tau_k \leq t_j\}} c_1(X(\tau_k-), X(\tau_k)) \right] \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int c_0(x) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx) + \int c_1(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

The tightness of $\{\mu_{0,t_j}\}$ implies the existence of a weak limit μ_0 ; without loss of generality, assume $\mu_{0,t_j} \Rightarrow \mu_0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Proposition 3.3 and its proof establish that

$$\int c_0 d\mu_0 \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int c_0 d\mu_{0,t_j} < J_0(\tau, Y) < \infty.$$

Since $G_n \in \mathcal{D}$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int AG_n d\mu_{0,t_j} = \int AG_n d\mu_0$. Proposition 5.5 implies that for each n ,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int AG_n(x) \mu_0(dx) + \int BG_n(y, z) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \right) = 0 \quad (5.27)$$

so adding (5.26) and (5.27) and taking the limit inferior as $n \rightarrow \infty$ yields,

$$\begin{aligned} J_0(\tau, Y) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int (AG_n(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int (BG_n(y, z) + c_1(y, z)) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \right) \\ &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int (AG_n(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_{0,t_j}(dx) \\ &\quad + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int (BG_n(x) + c_1(y)) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \\ &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int (AG_n(x) + c_0(x)) \mu_0(dx) \\ &\quad + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int (BG_n(x) + c_1(y)) \mu_{1,t_j}(dy \times dz) \\ &\geq F_0^*; \end{aligned}$$

Propositions 5.11 and 5.12 establish the last inequality. □

6 Examples

We take a look at several examples to illustrate that the conditions of Theorem 5.13 can be easily verified for both traditional and non-traditional cost structures.

6.1 Drifted Brownian motion inventory models

We begin by examining the classical model that has been studied by Bather (1966), Sulem (1986), Dai and Yao (2013), and many others. In particular, we show that Theorem 5.13 extends the result in He et al. (ArXiv 2016) and verifies optimality as a result of our analytical approach. We then examine a drifted Brownian motion process with reflection at $\{0\}$ using a non-traditional cost structure.

6.1.1 Classical model

In the absence of ordering, the inventory level process X_0 evolves in the state space $\mathbb{R}$ and satisfies

$$dX_0(t) = -\mu dt + \sigma dW(t), \quad X_0(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{I} := (-\infty, \infty) \quad (6.1)$$

in which $\mu, \sigma > 0$ and W is a standard Brownian motion process. Observe the model includes both positive and negative inventory levels indicating real inventory and items that have been back-ordered, respectively.

To specify the cost structure, the holding/back-order cost function c_0 defined on $\mathbb{R}$ and the ordering cost function c_1 defined on $\overline{\mathcal{R}} = \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y \leq z\}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} c_0(x) &= \begin{cases} -c_b x, & x < 0, \\ c_h x, & x \geq 0, \end{cases} \\ c_1(y, z) &= k_1 + k_2(z - y) \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

in which $c_b, c_h, k_1, k_2 > 0$. The coefficient c_b denotes the back-order cost rate per unit of inventory per unit of time while c_h is the holding cost rate. The ordering cost function is comprised of fixed plus proportional (to the order size) costs.

We now prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1. *For the classical drifted Brownian motion model, there exists some pair $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $F_0(y_0^*, z_0^*) = F_0^*$.*

Proof. In light of Theorem 4.8, it suffices to show that the model satisfies Conditions 2.1, 2.3 and 4.6.

Claim: Condition 2.1 is satisfied for the drifted Brownian motion inventory model.

It is well-known that both $-\infty$ and ∞ are natural boundaries for a drifted Brownian motion process. Easy computations show that the scale and speed densities are $s(x) = e^{2\mu x/\sigma^2}$ and $m(x) = \sigma^{-2}e^{-2\mu x/\sigma^2}$, respectively, so the scale and speed measures are given by

$$S[y, z] = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\mu} \left(e^{2\mu z/\sigma^2} - e^{2\mu y/\sigma^2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad M[y, z] = \frac{1}{2\mu} \left(e^{-2\mu y/\sigma^2} - e^{-2\mu z/\sigma^2} \right) \quad (6.3)$$

for any $[y, z] \subset \mathcal{I}$. It is now obvious that $S(-\infty, z] < \infty$ so $-\infty$ is attracting while $S[y, \infty) = \infty$ and thus ∞ is nonattracting.

Claim: Condition 2.3 holds for the classical drifted Brownian motion model.

The function c_0 is clearly continuous, decreasing on $(-\infty, 0)$ and increasing on $(0, \infty)$ with $c_0(\pm\infty) = \infty$. The observation that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{c_h}{\sigma^2} v e^{-2\mu v/\sigma^2} dv = \frac{c_h}{2\mu} \quad (6.4)$$

is sufficient for c_0 to satisfy Condition 2.3(a). From the definition of c_1 , it is obvious that $c_1 \in C(\overline{\mathcal{R}}) \cap C^2(\mathcal{R})$.

Claim: Condition 4.6 holds for the drifted Brownian motion model.

This claim is true since the boundaries $\pm\infty$ are natural and $c_0(\pm\infty) = \infty$ $\square$

Theorem 6.2. *Let (y_0^*, z_0^*) be as in Theorem 6.1. Then the (y_0^*, z_0^*) ordering policy defined by (4.1) is optimal in the class $\mathcal{A}_0$ for the drifted Brownian motion inventory model under the cost structure (6.2).*

Proof. We need to verify Condition 5.8 holds in order to apply Theorem 5.13 to show that the (y_0^*, z_0^*) ordering policy is optimal.

First, define the functions $\tilde{g}_0$ and $\tilde{\zeta}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_0(x) &= \int_0^x \int_u^\infty 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u) = \begin{cases} -\frac{c_b}{2\mu} x^2 - \frac{\sigma^2 c_b}{2\mu^2} x + \frac{\sigma^4(c_b+c_h)}{4\mu^3} (\exp\{\frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2}x\} - 1), & x < 0, \\ \frac{c_h}{2\mu} x^2 + \frac{\sigma^2 c_h}{2\mu^2} x, & x \geq 0 \end{cases} \\ \tilde{\zeta}(x) &= \int_0^x \int_u^\infty 2 dM(v) dS(u) = \frac{1}{\mu} x. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{\zeta} \in C^2(\mathcal{I})$. It therefore follows from (2.4) and (2.5), respectively, that

$$g_0(x) = \tilde{g}_0(x) - \tilde{g}_0(x_0) = \begin{cases} -\frac{c_b}{2\mu} x^2 - \frac{\sigma^2 c_b}{2\mu^2} x + \frac{\sigma^4(c_b+c_h)}{4\mu^3} (\exp\{\frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2}x\} - 1) - \tilde{g}_0(x_0), & x < 0, \\ \frac{c_h}{2\mu} x^2 + \frac{\sigma^2 c_h}{2\mu^2} x - \tilde{g}_0(x_0), & x \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (6.5)$$

and $\zeta(x) = \tilde{\zeta}(x) - \tilde{\zeta}(x_0) = \frac{1}{\mu}(x - x_0)$. Defining $\tilde{G}_0 = \tilde{g}_0 - F_0^* \tilde{\zeta}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} G_0(x) &= \tilde{G}_0(x) - \tilde{G}_0(x_0) \\ &= \begin{cases} -\frac{c_b}{2\mu} x^2 - \left(\frac{\sigma^2 c_b}{2\mu^2} + \frac{F_0^*}{\mu}\right) x + \frac{\sigma^4(c_b+c_h)}{4\mu^3} (\exp\{\frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2}x\} - 1) - \tilde{G}_0(x_0), & x < 0, \\ \frac{c_h}{2\mu} x^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma^2 c_h}{2\mu^2} - \frac{F_0^*}{\mu}\right) x - \tilde{G}_0(x_0), & x \geq 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We examine the cases $x < 0$ and $x > 0$ separately. For $x > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\sigma(x)G_0'(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)(1 + c_0(x))} &= \frac{\left(\frac{c_h\sigma}{\mu} x + \frac{\sigma^3 c_h}{2\mu^2} - \frac{F_0^*\sigma}{\mu}\right)^2}{\left(1 + \left|\frac{c_h}{2\mu} x^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma^2 c_h}{2\mu^2} - \frac{F_0^*}{\mu}\right) x - \tilde{G}_0(x_0)\right|\right) (1 + c_h x)}, \text{ and} \\ \frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} &= \frac{c_h x}{\left(1 + \left|\frac{c_h}{2\mu} x^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma^2 c_h}{2\mu^2} - \frac{F_0^*}{\mu}\right) x - \tilde{G}_0(x_0)\right|\right)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

and hence

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{[\sigma(x)G'_0(x)]^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^3} = 0, \text{ and } \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} = 0.$$

For $x < 0$, the ratios are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^3} &= \frac{\left(\frac{-c_b\sigma}{\mu}x - \left(\frac{\sigma^3 c_b}{2\mu^2} + \frac{F_0^* \sigma}{\mu}\right) + \frac{\sigma^2(c_b+c_h)}{2\mu^2} \exp\left(\frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2}x\right)\right)^2}{\left(1 + \left|\frac{-c_b}{2\mu}x^2 - \left(\frac{\sigma^3 c_b}{2\mu^2} + \frac{F_0^* \sigma}{\mu}\right)x + \frac{\sigma^4(c_b+c_h)}{4\mu^3}(\exp(\frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2}x) - 1) - \tilde{G}_0(x_0)\right|\right)^3}, \\ \frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} &= \frac{-c_b x}{\left(1 + \left|\frac{-c_b}{2\mu}x^2 - \left(\frac{\sigma^3 c_b}{2\mu^2} + \frac{F_0^* \sigma}{\mu}\right)x + \frac{\sigma^4(c_b+c_h)}{4\mu^3}(\exp(\frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2}x) - 1) - \tilde{G}_0(x_0)\right|\right)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^3} = 0, \text{ and } \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} = 0.$$

As a result, both ratios are uniformly bounded and the result holds. $\square$

6.1.2 Drifted Brownian motion with reflection at $\{0\}$

For this model, X is a drifted Brownian motion process that reflects at $\{0\}$. Thus when $X(t) > 0$, X follows the dynamics in (6.1) and Condition 2.1, except for (b,i), is established in the proof of Theorem 6.1 using $a = 0$. It is simple to see that $s(0)M[0, \infty) = \frac{1}{2\mu}$, completing the verification of Condition 2.1.

The cost structure is given by the functions c_0 on $[0, \infty)$ and c_1 on $\{(y, z) : 0 \leq y \leq z\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} c_0(x) &= k_3 x + k_4 e^{-x}, \\ c_1(y, z) &= k_1 + k_2 \sqrt{z - y}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

with $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 > 0$. Notice that the holding costs for small inventory levels are penalized by the term $k_4 e^{-x}$ which remains bounded at 0. Also, the ordering cost function is a concave function of the order size so incorporates savings due to economies of scale. We begin by establishing the existence of a pair of minimizers for F_0 .

The analysis below verifies the existence of an optimal (s, S) ordering policy in the class $\mathcal{A}_0$ which does not allow any positive amount of long-term average expected local time of the inventory process at $\{0\}$.

Theorem 6.3. *There exists an optimizing pair $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$ of F_0 for the drifted Brownian motion model with reflection having cost structure (6.7).*

Proof. To apply Theorem 4.8, we need to verify that Conditions 2.3 and 4.6 hold for this model. Notice that the inventory process takes values in $\mathcal{E} = [0, \infty)$, with 0 being a regular (reflecting) boundary and ∞ is a natural boundary.

The function c_0 is clearly continuous on $\mathcal{E}$ and $c_0(\infty) = \infty$. The integrability condition (2.1) follows from simple computation as for (6.4), while (2.2) is (6.4) for this example. Trivially, the ordering cost function c_1 is in $C[0, \infty) \cap C^2(0, \infty)$. Thus Condition 2.3 is satisfied.

By assumption on the model, the boundary 0 is regular (reflective) while the boundary ∞ is natural with $c_0(\infty) = \infty$. Thus Condition 4.6 holds. $\square$

Theorem 6.4. *Let (y_0^*, z_0^*) be as in Theorem 6.3. Then the (y_0^*, z_0^*) ordering policy is optimal in the class $\mathcal{A}_0$ for the reflected drifted Brownian motion inventory model under the cost structure (6.7).*

Proof. It suffices to show that Condition 5.8 holds. The proof of Theorem 6.2 shows that $\zeta(x) = \tilde{\zeta}(x) - \tilde{\zeta}(x_0)$ with $\tilde{\zeta}(x) = \frac{1}{\mu}x$ and, as in the same proof, straightforward computation establishes that

$$\tilde{g}_0(x) = \frac{k_3}{2\mu}x^2 + \frac{k_3\sigma^2}{2\mu^2}x + \frac{2k_4\sigma^2}{(2\mu+\sigma^2)^2}(1 - e^{-x})$$

so $g_0(x) = \tilde{g}_0(x) - \tilde{g}_0(x_0)$. Setting $\tilde{G}_0 = \tilde{g}_0 - F_0^*\tilde{\zeta}$, the function G_0 is

$$G_0(x) = \frac{k_3}{2\mu}x^2 + \left(\frac{k_3\sigma^2}{2\mu^2} - \frac{F_0^*}{\mu}\right)x + \frac{2k_4\sigma^2}{(2\mu+\sigma^2)^2}(1 - e^{-x}) - \tilde{G}_0(x_0).$$

At the left boundary 0, $c_0(0) = k_4$ and $G_0(0) = \frac{2k_4\sigma^2}{(2\mu+\sigma^2)^2} - \tilde{G}_0(x_0)$. It immediately follows from continuity that Condition 5.8(a,ii) and (c) hold. We thus need to examine the ratios of Condition 5.8 when x is large. These ratios differ only slightly from (6.6) (equating c_h with k_3) and the exponential term does not affect the limits. Thus Condition 5.8 holds and Theorem 5.13 then yields the results. $\square$

6.2 Geometric Brownian motion storage model

Without any ordering, the inventory process is a geometric Brownian motion evolving in the state space $(0, \infty)$ and satisfying the stochastic differential equation

$$dX_0(t) = -\mu X_0(t) dt + \sigma X_0(t) dW(t), \quad X(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{I} = (0, \infty),$$

in which $\mu, \sigma > 0$ and W is a standard Brownian motion process; the drift rate is negative. It is well-known that both boundaries are natural.

Lemma 6.5. *Condition 2.1 holds for this geometric Brownian motion storage model.*

Proof. For this model $s(x) = x^{2\mu/\sigma^2}$ and $m(x) = \sigma^{-2}x^{-2-2\mu/\sigma^2}$ and therefore the scale and speed measures are respectively given, for $[l, x] \subset \mathcal{I}$, by

$$\begin{aligned} S[l, x] &= \frac{\sigma^2}{2\mu+\sigma^2} \left[x^{1+2\mu/\sigma^2} - l^{1+2\mu/\sigma^2} \right] \quad \text{and} \\ M[l, x] &= \frac{1}{2\mu+\sigma^2} \left[l^{-1-2\mu/\sigma^2} - x^{-1-2\mu/\sigma^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, it follows that 0 is an attracting boundary while ∞ is a non-attracting boundary. $\square$

For the cost structure, we consider three examples to illustrate some of the different possible ways in which Proposition 4.5 and Theorem 5.13 can be employed. Some of these cost structures include forms that do not satisfy the modularity condition imposed in Helmes et al. (to appear), thus illustrating the breadth of application of the current results.

6.2.1 Linear holding costs

The cost function c_0 , defined on $\mathcal{E}$, is

$$c_0(x) = k_3x, \quad x \in (0, \infty) \quad (6.8)$$

in which $k_3 > 0$ and c_1 is any function satisfying Condition 2.3(b) such that for some $z > 0$, $c_1(0, z) := \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} c_1(y, z) < \infty$. Observe that the term k_3x incurs large holding costs for large inventory levels whereas only small costs are incurred as the level approaches 0.

We begin by establishing that this model satisfies Condition 2.3.

Lemma 6.6. *Condition 2.3 holds for this geometric Brownian motion storage model having costs given by (6.8).*

Proof. Considering the conditions on the cost structure, it is immediate that c_0 is continuous, monotone increasing everywhere, satisfies $c_0(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} c_0(x) = 0$, and $c_0(\infty) = \infty$. Finally notice that for each $y \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\int_y^\infty (k_3v)(\sigma^{-2}v^{-(2\mu/\sigma^2)-2}) dv = \frac{k_3}{2\mu} y^{-2\mu/\sigma^2} < \infty \quad (6.9)$$

and hence c_0 satisfies Condition 2.3(a). The ordering cost function c_1 satisfies Condition 2.3(b) by assumption. $\square$

We remark that 0 is an attracting boundary as long as $1 + \frac{2\mu}{\sigma^2} > 0$ so the drift coefficient $-\mu$ could be positive. The computation in (6.9), however, requires the $\mu > 0$ in order that Condition 2.3(a) be satisfied.

Theorem 6.7. *There does not exist any optimal (s, S) ordering policy for the geometric Brownian motion model having linear holding costs given in (6.8).*

Proof. Since $c_0(0) = 0$ and there exists some $z > 0$ for which $c_1(0, z) < \infty$, Lemma 2.6 implies the conditions of Proposition 4.5(a) hold. $\square$

This result is quite intuitive since, under a negative drift, the geometric Brownian motion process converges almost surely to 0. Any order will simply delay the process from this convergence and thus have greater holding costs while also incurring ordering costs. The “no order” policy will be optimal.

6.2.2 Nonlinear holding costs with ordering costs that are a concave function of order size

The cost functions c_0 defined on $\mathcal{E}$ and c_1 defined on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} c_0(x) &= k_3x + k_4x^\beta, & x \in (0, \infty), \\ c_1(y, z) &= k_1 + k_2\sqrt{z - y}, & (y, z) \in \{(y, z) \in (0, \infty)^2 : y \leq z\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

in which $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 > 0$ and $\beta < 0$. For this c_0 function, k_4x^β is extremely costly as the level approaches 0. The proof of the next lemma is virtually identical to that of Lemma 6.6 so is left to the reader.

Lemma 6.8. *Condition 2.3 holds for this geometric Brownian motion storage model.*

We now turn to the existence of an optimal (s, S) ordering policy.

Theorem 6.9. *There exists an optimal (y_0^*, z_0^*) ordering policy for the geometric Brownian motion storage model having nonlinear cost structure given by (6.10).*

Proof. By Theorem 5.13, it suffices to show that Conditions 4.6 and 5.8 hold. As previously noted, 0 and ∞ are natural boundaries and we have just seen that $c_0(0) = \infty$ and $c_0(\infty) = \infty$ so Condition 4.6(a,i) and (b,i) hold.

Let $\rho = \frac{\sigma^2 \beta^2}{2} - \mu\beta$ and note $\rho > 0$. Straightforward computations using (2.4) and (2.5), respectively, determine

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(x) &= \frac{k_3}{\mu}(x - x_0) - \frac{k_4}{\rho}(x^\beta - x_0^\beta), & x \in \mathcal{I}, \\ \zeta(x) &= \frac{2}{2\mu + \sigma^2}(\ln(x) - \ln(x_0)), & x \in \mathcal{I}. \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$G_0(x) = \frac{k_3}{\mu}(x - x_0) - \frac{k_4}{\rho}(x^\beta - x_0^\beta) - \frac{2F_0^*}{2\mu + \sigma^2}(\ln(x) - \ln(x_0)).$$

As a result, we have

$$\frac{(\sigma(x)G_0'(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^3} = \frac{\left(\frac{k_3\sigma}{\mu}x + \frac{k_4\sigma(-\beta)}{\rho}x^\beta - \frac{2F_0^*}{\mu + (\sigma^2/2)}\right)^2}{\left(1 + \left|\frac{k_3}{\mu}(x - x_0) - \frac{k_4}{\rho}(x^\beta - x_0^\beta) - \frac{2F_0^*}{2\mu + \sigma^2}(\ln(x) - \ln(x_0))\right|\right)^3}$$

so at the left boundary $a = 0$,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\sigma(x)G_0'(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^3} = 0 \quad (6.11)$$

Turning to the boundary $b = \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(\sigma(x)G_0'(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)(1 + c_0(x))} \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{k_3\sigma}{\mu}x + \frac{k_4\sigma(-\beta)}{\rho}x^\beta - \frac{2F_0^*}{\mu + (\sigma^2/2)}\right)^2}{\left(1 + \left|\frac{k_3}{\mu}(x - x_0) - \frac{k_4}{\rho}(x^\beta - x_0^\beta) - \frac{2F_0^*}{2\mu + \sigma^2}(\ln(x) - \ln(x_0))\right|\right)(1 + k_3x + k_4x^\beta)} \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\sigma(x)G_0'(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)(1 + c_0(x))} = \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu}. \quad (6.12)$$

Finally, we have

$$\frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} = \frac{k_3x + k_4x^\beta}{\left(1 + \left|\frac{k_3}{\mu}(x - x_0) - \frac{k_4}{\rho}(x^\beta - x_0^\beta) - \frac{2F_0^*}{2\mu + \sigma^2}(\ln(x) - \ln(x_0))\right|\right)^2}$$

which gives

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} = 0 = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_0(x)}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^2} = 0. \quad (6.13)$$

As a result, (6.11), (6.12) and (6.13) imply that Condition 5.8(a,i) and (b,i) hold. $\square$

6.2.3 Piecewise linear holding costs with modular ordering costs

The cost functions c_0 on $[0, \infty)$ and c_1 on $\{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : y \leq z\}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_0(x) &= \begin{cases} k_4(1-x), & 0 \leq x \leq 1, \\ k_3(x-1), & x \geq 1 \end{cases} \\ c_1(y, z) &= k_1 + \frac{k_2}{2}(y^{-1/2} - z^{-1/2}) + \frac{k_2}{2}(z - y) \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

with $k_1, k_2, k_3 > 0$ and $k_4 > (\sigma^2 + 2\mu) \left[k_1 + \frac{k_2}{2}(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \frac{k_2\mu + 2k_3}{2\mu}(e - 1) \right] - 2k_3$. Note $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} c_1(y, z) = \infty$, placing a very strong penalty on waiting until the inventory level is nearly 0. In this example, the holding cost rate decreases at rate k_4 on $[0, 1]$ and increases at rate k_3 thereafter. The function c_1 is modular in the sense that for any $0 < w \leq x \leq y \leq z$, $c_1(x, z) - c_1(x, y) - c_1(w, z) + c_1(w, y) = 0$. By writing c_1 in the form

$$c_1(y, z) = k_1 + k_2 \left(\frac{\frac{(y^{-1/2} - z^{-1/2})}{z - y} + 1}{2} \right) (z - y)$$

the cost per unit portion of the charge is smaller with large values of y and z so encourages the decision maker to order before the inventory falls very low and prefers large orders.

Lemma 6.10. *The geometric Brownian motion model with cost structure given in (6.14) satisfies Condition 2.3.*

Proof. The continuity of c_0 on $[0, \infty)$ is immediate and $c_0(\infty) = \infty$. Also (6.9) demonstrates the integrability of c_0 with respect to M . The function c_1 clearly satisfies the requisite conditions in Condition 2.3(b). $\square$

Theorem 6.11. *The geometric Brownian motion model with cost functions given by (6.14) satisfies Condition 4.6 and hence there exists an optimizing pair $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$ of the function F_0 .*

Proof. Begin by defining the functions $\tilde{\zeta}(x) = \frac{2}{2\mu + \sigma^2} \ln(x)$ for $x \in (0, \infty)$ and $\tilde{g}_0$ on $(0, \infty)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_0(x) &= \int_1^x \int_u^\infty 2c_0(v) dM(v) dS(u) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{2k_4}{2\mu + \sigma^2} \ln(x) - \frac{k_4}{\mu}(x - 1) + \frac{\sigma^4(k_3 + k_4)}{\mu(2\mu + \sigma^2)^2} (x^{(2\mu + \sigma^2)/\sigma^2} - 1), & x < 1 \\ \frac{k_3}{\mu}(x - 1) - \frac{2k_3}{2\mu + \sigma^2} \ln(x), & x \geq 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (2.4) and (2.5) that $g_0(x) = \tilde{g}_0(x) - \tilde{g}_0(x_0)$ and $\zeta(x) = \tilde{\zeta}(x) - \tilde{\zeta}(x_0)$, respectively. Note that $g'_0 = \tilde{g}'_0$ and $\zeta' = \tilde{\zeta}'$.

Since 0 is a natural boundary and $c_0(0) = k_4 < \infty$, we need to verify that for each $z \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $0 < y_z < z$ such that for all $0 < y < y_z$,

$$\frac{-\frac{\partial c_1}{\partial y}(y, z) + g'_0(y)}{\zeta'(y)} \geq F_0(y, z)$$

and the existence of $(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$ for which $F_0(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) < k_4$. Arbitrarily fix $z \in (0, \infty)$. Since we need y sufficiently close to 0, using $y < 1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-\frac{\partial c_1}{\partial y}(y, z) + g'_0(y)}{\zeta'(y)} &= \frac{\frac{k_2}{2}(y^{-3/2} - 1) + \frac{2k_4}{(2\mu+\sigma^2)}y^{-1} - \frac{k_4}{\mu} + \frac{\sigma^2(k_3+k_4)}{\mu(2\mu+\sigma^2)}y^{2\mu/\sigma^2}}{\frac{2}{(2\mu+\sigma^2)}y^{-1}} \\ &= \frac{k_2(2\mu+\sigma^2)}{4}(y^{-1/2} - y) + k_4 + \frac{k_4(2\mu+\sigma^2)}{2\mu}y + \frac{\sigma^2(k_3+k_4)}{2\mu}y^{(2\mu+\sigma^2)/\sigma^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(y, z) &= \frac{k_1 + \frac{k_2}{2}(y^{-1/2} - z^{-1/2}) + \frac{k_2}{2}(z - y)}{\frac{2}{2\mu+\sigma^2}(\ln(z) - \ln(y))} \\ &\quad + \frac{g_0(z) - \frac{2k_4}{2\mu+\sigma^2}\ln(y) + \frac{k_4}{\mu}(y - 1) - \frac{\sigma^4(k_3+k_4)}{\mu(2\mu+\sigma^2)^2}(y^{(2\mu+\sigma^2)/\sigma^2} - 1)}{\frac{2}{2\mu+\sigma^2}(\ln(z) - \ln(y))} \\ &= k_4 + \frac{k_1 + \frac{k_2}{2}(y^{-1/2} - z^{-1/2}) + \frac{k_2}{2}(z - y)}{\frac{2}{2\mu+\sigma^2}(\ln(z) - \ln(y))} \\ &\quad + \frac{g_0(z) - \frac{2k_4}{2\mu+\sigma^2}\ln(z) + \frac{k_4}{\mu}(y - 1) - \frac{\sigma^4(k_3+k_4)}{\mu(2\mu+\sigma^2)^2}(y^{(2\mu+\sigma^2)/\sigma^2} - 1)}{\frac{2}{2\mu+\sigma^2}(\ln(z) - \ln(y))}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the leading order terms as $y \rightarrow 0$ are $y^{-1/2}$ and $\frac{y^{-1/2}}{\ln(y)}$, respectively, it follows that

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{F_0(y, z)}{-\frac{\partial c_1}{\partial y}(y, z) + g'_0(y)} = 0$$

and hence there exists some $y_z > a$ so that (4.10) holds for all $a < y < y_z$.

Finally observe that the choice $(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) = (1, e)$ has

$$F_0(1, e) = (\sigma^2 + 2\mu) \left[k_1 + \frac{k_2}{2}(1 - e^{-1/2}) + \frac{k_2\mu + 2k_3}{2\mu}(e - 1) \right] - 2k_3 < k_4$$

by the model restriction on k_4 . □

Theorem 6.12. *There exists an optimal (y_0^*, z_0^*) ordering policy for the geometric Brownian motion model having nonlinear cost structure given by (6.14).*

Proof. Existence of $(y_0^*, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{R}$ with $F_0(y_0^*, z_0^*) = F_0^*$ follows from Theorem 6.11. To apply Theorem 5.13, we need to show that Condition 5.8 holds.

Defining $\tilde{G}_0 = \tilde{g}_0 - F_0^* \tilde{\zeta}$ with $\tilde{\zeta}(x) = \frac{2}{2\mu+\sigma^2} \ln(x)$, it follows that $G_0(x) = \tilde{G}_0(x) - \tilde{G}_0(x_0)$ and so $G'_0(x) = \tilde{g}'_0(x) - F_0^* \tilde{\zeta}'(x)$. As a result, for x sufficiently large, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2 &= \left(\frac{\sigma k_3}{\mu}x - \frac{2(\sigma k_3 + F_0^*)}{2\mu+\sigma^2} \right)^2, \\ 1 + |G_0(x)| &= 1 + \frac{k_3}{\mu}(x - 1) - \frac{2(k_3 + F_0^*)}{2\mu+\sigma^2} \ln(x) - \tilde{g}_0(x_0) \text{ and} \\ c_0(x) &= k_3(x - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)(1 + c_0(x))} = \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2}{(1 + |G_0(x)|)^{2+\epsilon}} = 0.$$

For x in a neighbourhood of the left boundary 0,

$$G_0(x) = \frac{2(k_4 - F_0^*)}{2\mu + \sigma^2} \ln(x) - \frac{k_4}{\mu}(x - 1) + \frac{\sigma^4(k_3 + k_4)}{\mu(2\mu + \sigma^2)^2}(x^{(2\mu + \sigma^2)/\sigma^2} - 1) - \tilde{g}_0(x_0), \quad \text{and}$$

$$(\sigma(x)G'_0(x))^2 = \left(-\frac{\sigma^2(\sigma^2 k_4 - 2\mu F_0^*)}{\mu(2\mu + \sigma^2)}x + \frac{\sigma^4(k_3 + k_4)}{\mu(2\mu + \sigma^2)}x^{(2\mu + \sigma^2)/\sigma^2} \right)^2.$$

It follows that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} G_0(x) = -\infty$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} (\sigma^2(x)G'_0(x))^2 = 0$, which then implies that Condition 5.8(a) is satisfied. $\square$

References

- Bather, J. A. (1966). A continuous time inventory model. *J. Appl. Probability*, 3:538–549.
- Bensoussan, A. (2011). *Dynamic programming and inventory control*, Studies in Probability, Optimization and Statistics, IOS Press, Amsterdam.
- Dai, J. G. and Yao, D. (2013). Brownian inventory models with convex holding cost, part 1: Average-optimal controls. *Stoch. Syst.*, 3(2):442–499.
- He, S. S., Yao, D. D. and Zhang, H. H. (2016). Optimal Ordering Policy for Inventory Systems with Quantity-Dependent Setup Costs. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- Helmes, K. L., Stockbridge, R. H. and Zhu, C. (to appear). Continuous inventory models of diffusion type: long-term average cost criterion. *Annals Appl. Probab.*
- Helmes, K. L., Stockbridge, R. H. and Zhu, C. (preprint). A Counterintuitive Example in Inventory Management.
- Karlin, S. and Taylor, H. M. (1981). *A second course in stochastic processes*. Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York.
- Sulem, A. (1986). A solvable one-dimensional model of a diffusion inventory system. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 11(1):125–133.
- Yao, D., Chao, X. and Wu, J. (2015). Optimal control policy for a Brownian inventory system with concave ordering cost. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 52:909–925.